BS1305
.8
.C69

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 1913
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCC
#11,878
~~BS1305~~
~~.8~~
~~.C69~~

Lady Cameron
from Mr. Kent 1903

C. D. Heathcote
Black-Torrington Rectory
Sale
June 28th 1883.
To be retained because it is by
a County Author.

267 COLERIDGE (Rev. John, *of Ottery*) Miscellaneous Dissertations on Judges XVII and XVIII, Author's MS. Corrections, 8vo, *old calf*, 5s, *scarce* *Privately Printed*, 1768

MISCELLANEOUS

DISSERTATIONS,

ARISING FROM THE

XVIIth and XVIIIth Chapters

OF THE

BOOK of JUDGES.

BY

The Rev. Mr. JOHN COLERIDGE,
Vicar of, and Schoolmaſter at, Ottery St. Mary, Devon.

LIBRARY OF PRI

LONDON:
Printed for the AUTHOR.
MDCCLXVIII.

TO THE

HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER IN GOD,

FREDERIC,

LORD BISHOP OF EXON,

THESE

DISSERTATIONS

ARE,

BY HIS LORDSHIP'S APPROBATION,

HUMBLY DEDICATED,

BY HIS LORDSHIP'S MOST DUTIFUL,

OBEDIENT, AND OBLIGED SERVANT,

JOHN COLERIDGE.

SUBSCRIBERS NAMES.

A.

Revd. Gerveys Allen, curate of Wendron
Revd. Mr. Aſkew, rector of Blendworth
Sir John St. Aubyn, bart. of Clowance, Cornwall
Revd. John Allen, South-Molton
Mr. John Adams of Marianſleigh

B.

Revd. George Baker, archdeacon of Totnes
Richard Baker, Eſq; of Penryn, Cornwall, collector of exciſe
Revd. Thomas Baker
Mrs. Catherine Behenna, Penryn
Revd. Hugh Bennet
Revd. Thomas Biſhop, M. D. V. of South Molton
Revd. Mr. Blake of Fairway, four books
Revd. George Bent of Exbourne, Devonſhire
Mrs. Margaret Blackmore of Biſhops-Nymet, widow
Revd. John Bond of Crediton
Mr. Richard Bovet of Wellington, ſurgeon
William Brereton of Bath, Eſq;
Captain Edward Brereton.
Revd. Mr. Bradford of Pinhoe, two books
Mr. Arthur Brown, bookſeller, of Honiton
Revd. Richard Bryan, B. D. rector of Eaſt-Worlington
Mr. Nicholas Brooks of Exeter, merchant
Revd. James Buckingham of Stithians
Mrs. Buller of Downs, Crediton, Cornwall
John Buller of Morwall, Cornwall, Eſq; four books
Francis Buller, Eſq;
Mr. Thomas Bulley, merchant
Revd. Mr. Buncombe, Otterry.
Revd. Mr. Barrington, vicar of Chudleigh
Francis Baſſet of Trehiddy, Eſq; Cornwall
Revd. Daniel Batwell, London
John Ralph Battie, Eſq; London
Mr. John Binn, London
William Black, Eſq; London
Revd. Richard Bawden, South-Molton
Revd. John Burgeſs
Revd. Dennis Buckingham, rector of Charles

Revd. Thomas Barnes, rector of Rackenford
Mr. Samuel Badcock, South-Molton
Mr. Hugh Bowdon of Molland
Mr. John Berry of Swimbridge.

C.

Rt. hon. vifc. lord Courtenay
Rt. hon. lady Courtenay
Revd. Mr. Carrington, chancellor of the diocefe of Exon
Mr. Daniel John Cailler of Exeter, merchant
Mr. John Carter of Rofe-Aſh
Revd. Mr. John Carlyon of Truro
Amos Callard of Ford, Eſq;
Mr. James Corniſh of Teignmouth
Mr. John Carpenter of Tavyton, near Tavyſtock
Mr. Coryndon Carpenter, of Launceſton
Mr. William Chowne
Mr. John Churchill of Ottery St. Mary
Mr. Robert Clapp, ditto
Maſter George Clapp, ditto
Miſs Sarah Clapp, ditto
Richd. Copleſtone of Knightſtone, Eſq; ditto
Mrs. Joanna Copleſtone, dit.
Mr. John Chapman of Piddle-town, ſurgeon
Revd. Mr. Chicheſter, rector of George Ham and Sherwell
Lady Chicheſter of Sandford
Mr. Collins of Exeter, apothecary
Revd. Mr. Cooke of Mary-Clyſt, four books
Edward Coode, junior, Eſq; Penryn, Cornwall
Mrs. Elizabeth Clies, Penryn, Cornwall
William Crowgley, Eſq; Penryn, Cornwall
Mrs. Cummins of Penroſe, Cornwall
Moſes da Coſta, Eſq; London, two books
Revd. William Churchward, rector of Goodleigh
Revd. John Cutcliffe, A. M. rector of Ring's Aſh
Mr. William Cooke, Clovelly
Revd. Roger Challice, at Mayfield, near Lewes, Suſſex, ſix books

D.

John Duke, of Otterton, Eſq; four books
Miſs Dicks of Exeter
Lady Drake, 10s. 6d.
Miſs Anne Duke
Miſs Sarah Duke of Knightſtone
Mrs. Dodge of Elfordleigh
Mr. Thomas Drake, gent. of Culliton
Mr. Charles Davy, North-Molton
Mr. Samuel Dunning, South-Molton

Mr.

Mr. William Dale, South-Molton
Mr. William Dewey, Arlington, two books

E.

Mr. John Enys of Enys, Cornwall, 4 books
Mr. James Escott, merchant
Revd. Dr. Elliston, master of Sidney-Sussex college, Cambridge
Revd. Mr. Ewings of Feniton
Mr. Elliot of Ottery
Revd. Mr. Evans of Appledoor.

F.

Henry Fry of Deer-park, Esq;
Mr. Ford of Exeter, two books
Mr. Furlong, surgeon and apothecary of Exeter
Mr. Thomas Furlong, junior, of Exeter
Revd. Mr. Ford of Off-hall
Revd. William Ford, rector of Northleigh
Revd. Dr. Fynes of Moreton-Hampstead, D. D.
Mr. Charles Fynes, in Oxford
Revd. James Flexman, vicar of North-Molton

G.

Thomas Gibson of Gittisham, Esq;
James Garrett, Esq;
Mr. Thomas Gibbons of Ottery St. Mary
Mr. William Govier of Bishops-Nymet
Thomas Glynn, junior, Esq; of Helston
Mr. Nicholas Geare, chapter-clerk of Exeter
Thomas Gildeart, Esq; London
Mr. John Goss, merchant
William Henry Guyon, Esq; London
James Godin, Esq; ditto
Peter Gaulson, Esq; ditto
Mr. Lewis Glave, ditto
Mr. Timothy Griffies, clerk of Comb-Martin

H.

Revd. John Hockin of Okehampton
Revd. William Hole, archdeacon of Barnstaple
Revd. Mr Hatherly of Colliton
Revd. Mr. Hill of Honiton
Revd. Charles Harward of Tallaton
Mrs. Heath of Ottery St. Mary
Revd. Charles Hutton, rector of George Nympton
Miss Jenny Holmes
Miss Nancy Holmes
Arthur Holdsworth, Esq;
Southcot Hallet, Esq;
Revd. Richard Hallet of Axmouth
Revd Mr. Hobbs of Colliton-Rawleigh

Revd.

Revd. Sampſon Harris, curate of Falmouth
Revd. Mr. Horſenden, near Torrington, Devon.
Revd. M. Hurell, rector of Drewſteignton
Mrs. Mary Hearle, Penryn, Cornwall
William Hill of Carwarthewick, Eſq;
Revd. John Hoſkin, vicar of Manaccan
Revd. Mr. Henvill, rector of Rowner, M. A.
Revd. Mr. Harris, rector of Widley, M. A.
Revd. Thomas Hewitt, vicar of Weſtbury, Wiltſhire
Mr. John Hole, ſurgeon in Iſlington
Mr. John Hames, Brumpton-grove
Mr. Robert Paſcoe Hamlyn, attorney at law
Mr. Chriſtopher Henderſon, London
Abraham Hake, Eſq; London
William Halhead, Eſq; ditto
William Hammond, Eſq; dit.
Revd. John Hole, rector of Romanſleigh
Revd. William Hole
Mr. Edmund Huxtable, Chittlehampton
Revd. Thomas Hole, rector of North-Tawton
Revd. Joſhua Hole
Revd. Arthur Hole, ſchoolmaſter at Bath
Revd. Mr. Heath, rector of Sanford Courtenay

I.

Revd. Mr. Jackſon, vicar of Titchfield, D. D.
Revd. Mr. Jenkins of Up. Ottery
Mr. Richard Johnſon, ſurgeon and apothecary of Ottery St. Mary

K.

Revd. Dr. Benjamin Kennicott, Fellow of Exeter-college, Oxford
FrancisKirkham,Eſq;Croen, Cornwall
Mr. Abraham Kingdon, South Molton
Mr. William Keen, merchant.

L.

Revd. John Lovelace of Great Waltham, Eſſex,
Mr. John Leigh of Ottery St. Mary
Revd. Mr. Longman, curate of Harford
Revd. Mr. Lewis of Honiton
Henry Laroche, Eſq;
Revd. Dr. PhilipLloyd, D.D. dean of Norwich, four books
Revd. Mr. Longman of Claybydon
Mr. James Langdon of Biſhops Nympton
Thomas Lampriere, Eſq, London

Mr.

Mr. Stephen Ludlow, South-Molton
Revd. Samuel Lavington, Biddeford
Mr. Anthony Lavercombe of Bratton-Fleming
Mr. John Lane of Morchard
Mr Philip Lane of ditto
Revd. John Leſhbridge of Launceſton
Mr. George Leach of Plymouth
Mr. John Luxmore, attorney at Law, Okehampton, four books
Mr. Chriſtopher Cuningham Luxmoore
Mr. Charles Luxmoore

M.

Mrs. Ann Mundy, Ottery St. Mary
Mrs. Mundy, ditto
Miſs Dolly Mundy, ditto
Mrs. Elizabeth Mundy, ditto
Maſter Matthew Mundy, ditto
Revd. Richard Maurice, rector of Burſton
Mr. Richard Marker of Ottery
Revd. Mr. Manning, curate of Shobrooke
Revd. Mr. Manning of Cullumpton
Mr. Nicholas Medland of Exeter
Thomas Marſh of Wellington, Eſq;
Revd. Mr. Marker of Wellington
Revd. Mr. Mallock, curate of Axmouth
Revd. Mr. Morriſon, rector of Langtree
Revd. Hooper Moriſon, rector of Atherington
Revd. Thomas Michell, rector of Verian, Cornwall
Revd. Edward Marſhall, vicar of St. Evell, Cornwall
Revd. John Marſhall, maſter of the Free-ſchool Exeter
Mr. John Moore, London
Revd. John Mogridge, Exeter-college, Oxford
Revd. Thomas Melhuiſh, vicar of Witheridge

N.

Sir Stafford Northcote, bart. of Ottery
Revd. Samuel Newte of Tiverton
Revd. Mr. Newcomb, prieſt-vicar at Exeter
Lady North, 10 s. 6 d.
Mr. Philip Nickels, Twitching
Mr. George Newell, Barnſtaple
Revd. Thomas Neylor, vicar of Aſhburton

O.

Revd. William Oſborne, vicar of Milor and Mabe, Cornwall
Sir William Oglander, bart. Beamiſter

Mr.

P.

Mr. Thomas Powel, ſurgeon and apothecary
Revd. James Pierce of Biſhops-Nympton
Thomas Pitt of Boconnoch, Eſq;
Samuel Pierce, Eſq; of Yendacott
John Stoker Pearce, Eſq; of Sydbury
Thomas Pitt, Eſq; major of the Devonſhire militia, four books
Revd. William Putt of Gittiſham
Mr. Adam Pierce of Exeter, four books
Mr. William Pannel of Lympſton
Sir John Pole, bart.
Revd. Mr. Prieſt, rector of Sowley
Benjamin Pender, Eſq; of Penryn, receiver of the land tax for the county of Cornwall
Revd. Henry Philips, vicar of Gwennap, Cornwall
Mr. Robert Paul, Exeter
Mr. Daniel Pender of Falmouth
Revd. John Penroſe, vicar of Gluvias and Budock, Cornwall
Sir Wilmot Prideaux, bart. of Netherton
Frederic Pigou, Eſq; London
Revd. Henry Parminter, rector of Stoke-Rivers
Mr. John Palfreman, Molland

Q.

Revd. Mr. Quicke, chancellor of the church at Exeter
John Quicke, Eſq; Nanſwyden, Cornwall
Mrs. Quicke of ditto
Andrew Quicke, Eſq; of Ethe, Cornwall
Mr. James Quartley, Molland

R.

Mr. John Robins, merchant
Mr. John Rowe, author of the Treatiſe on Fluxions
Mr. John Richards, Exeter
Revd. Mr. Richards
Revd. Mr. Rowe of Awliſcombe
Henry Roſewarne, of Truro, Eſq;
Philip Richards, of Penryn, Eſq;
Revd. William Robinſon, vicar of Wendron
Mr. William Richards of Crowan, Cornwall
Giles Rooke, Eſq; London
Joſhua Readſhaw, Eſq; London
Chriſtian Morice Rodatz, Eſq; London, two books
Revd. P. Rowland, M. A. miniſter of Wheeler's chapel, Norton-falgate
Mr. William Rogerſon, London
Revd. William Rider, A. B. ſurmaſter of Paul's-ſchool
John Rooke, Eſq; London

Revd. John Radford, rector of Lapford
Rev. John Robins, rector of Clovelly

S.

Revd. Peter Sherwin of Aſhwater
John Seſſe, Eſq; Ottery
James Shepheard, Eſq; Ottery
Revd. Mr. Syndercombe of Ayleſbeare
Revd. Gregory Syndercombe, rector of Symondſbury, Dorſetſhire
Revd. Gregory Syndercombe, junior, curate of Aſkerſwell, ditto
Mrs. Sweet, Ottery
Revd. John Southcomb, A. M. rector of Roſe-Aſh
Mr. Stoaks, Exeter
Revd. Mr. Selfe of Piddletown
Revd. Mr. Stinton, rector of Martinhoe
Mr. Thomas Satchell of Colliton
Mr. George Stevens, Biſhops Nympton
Mr. John Stevens, Dunſter, Somerſet.
Revd. Mr. Sleech, archdeacon of Exeter, two books
Revd. Mr. Sawkins, of Beamiſter
Miſs Catherine Savery
Revd. Sampſon Sandys, rector of Landewednack
Revd. Mr. Sleep, curate of Lyme-Regis
William Spicer of Weer, Eſq; three books
Miſs —— Sainthill
Revd. Mr. Sanders of Sydmouth
Mr. Edward Score, bookſeller of Exeter
Mr. John Sharland, joiner, South-Molton
Mr. Thomas Scott, Chittlehampton

T.

Revd. Mr. Toplady of Harford, two books
Mr. Nicholas Tripe, ſurgeon and apothecary of Aſhburton
Mrs. Tuckfield of Fulford, two books
Thomas Taylor, Eſq; of Denbury
Mrs. Taylor of Yendacott
Mrs Rebecca Taylor
Revd. Joſeph Taylor
Maſter Pierce Joſeph Taylor
Revd. Mr. Tucker of Honiton
Revd. Mr. Tucker of Lyme-Regis
Mr. James Thomas of Witheridge
Mrs. Mary Turner of Shobrooke
Revd. Joſias Tucker of Bradford-kelly
Mr. John Turner of Cadbury

Robert

Robert Cotton Trefuſies, Eſq; of Trefuſies, Cornwall
Harry Thompſon, Eſq; London
Peter Thelluſſon, Eſq; ditto
William Thompſon, Eſq; ditto
Mr. Philip Tapp, Biſhops-Nympton
Mr. Lewis Toms, jun. ditto
Mr. John Thorne, ditto
Mr. Robert Tanner, Roſe-Aſh
Revd. Mr. Tickell of Eaton

V.

Revd. John Vickry, of Milton abbot, Devon.
Mr. Vaughan, Ottery
Mr. Peter de Vial, merchant, Exeter
Revd. Mr. Upton of Corhampton
Mr. John Voigt, London

W.

Revd. Mr. Warell, M. A. Hants
Mr. Woodrow of Towton, gent.
Mr. Thomas Whitborn, merchant
Mr. John Warren, Ottery
Mr. John White, Exeter
Mr. Henry Wilmot, ditto
Mr. Robert Williams, druggiſt, Honiton
Mrs. Williams of Cadhay
Miſs Williams at Cadhay, 10s. 6d.
John Wolſton, Eſq;
Mr. Nathaniel Whitcomb, Ottery
Maximilian Woolcot of Sydbury, Eſq;
Revd. Mr. Whitlock, rector of Runnington
Mr. Robert Weſtron, Wellington, attorney at law.
Revd. Mr. Whitfield, rector of Biddeford
Revd. Mr. Worth, rector of High Bickington
Mr. Daniel Williams of Penryn, Cornwall
Revd. Mr. Woolls, M. A. rector of Fareham
Mr. John Woolls of Portſmouth
Revd. Thomas Wood of Tiverton
Revd. Robert White, prebendary of Exeter
John Wilcox, Eſq; London
William Wood, Eſq; ditto

Y.

Sir William Yea, bart.
Sir George Yonge, bart. one of the lords of the Admiralty
Mr. James Yonge, near Plymouth
Miſs —— Yonge
Miſs Amelia Yonge
Mrs Yonge
Revd. Mr. Yonge, vicar of Great Torrington

MISCELLANEOUS DISSERTATIONS.

CHAP. I.

INTRODUCTION.

AN Hebrew Bible and Greek Teſtament at the head of a ſtudy recommend at firſt ſight the poſſeſſor, as a friend to Chriſtianity, learned in languages, and employing his leiſure to the beſt improvement of learning; and the prime poſition is juſtly aſſigned to theſe books for their ſuperior excellence, ſince all other tracts of learning fall ſhort of their doctrines, either in point of antiquity or in reſpect of truth. If we conſider them as one volume, they contain the moſt elevated language and poetical diction, the moſt

remote as well as true hiſtory, the moſt ancient geography, and the only perfect ſyſtem of ethics.—Their moſt abſtruſe parts, when well explained, afford the true knowledge of ancient Jewiſh cuſtoms, notions, and idioms, and often trace out — what without them would be more perplexing to find than the head of the Nile—the origin of the religious practices and opinions that prevailed in the Heathen world.

The ſpirit, indeed, of ſublimity and poetry pervades all the Eaſtern languages; but in the writings of the prophets and poets, in thoſe divine books, appears with ſuperior luſtre. The words and expreſſions do not only there inſtruct, move the paſſions, and delight the reaſon of man; but often ſtrike in the ſtrongeſt glare of eloquence and figure. Amplification, for inſtance, is a favourite figure of orators and poets, and often ariſes *from a various definition, or deſcription of the ſame thing* (Thus we find God deſcribed, Amos iv. 3. by, *He that formeth the mountains, that createth the wind, that declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkneſs, that treadeth upon the*

the high places of the earth), or *from conſequences amaſſed together*; by which we may ſee, Lamen. iv. 3 and 4, &c. a famine ſet forth in ſtriking colours, by that obdurateneſs which ſelf-preſervation at that time cauſes men periſhing to practiſe to each other, by the blackneſs of the ſkin, and by the eating of human fleſh, even the fleſh of their own children; and each conſequence exaggerated by the moſt ſtriking circumſtances. *Even the ſea-monſters draw out the breaſt, they give ſuck to their young ones; the daughter of my people is become cruel, like the oſtriches in the wilderneſs. The tongue of the ſucking child cleaveth to the roof of his mouth for thirſt; the young children aſk bread, and no man breaketh it unto them.* How ſtrongly painted is this miſery, when the once tender parent can ſee her little babe to periſh for want of the breaſt? Again, after enumeration of the great change in "the features of the "Nazarites, which were purer than ſnow, "whiter than milk, more ruddy than rubies, "ſmoother than ſaphires; but now blacker than "coals, with bones jutting out thro' the ſkin, "which is withered, like the dried ſkin of a "branch of a tree;" we have the fury of famine

mine drawn in its extreme horrors, when "the hands of the *pitiful* women broiled their "own children for food, in the deſtruction of "their city." If we turn our eyes to that ſpecies of amplification which conſiſts in a collection of ſimilitudes, we may find thicker and more ſtriking compariſons in the Scriptures, than in any the moſt celebrated prophane writer. The coming of the Chaldean in Habakk. i. 7, 8. repreſents the ſudden inroads of Tartarian robbers, whoſe ſpeed is expreſſed by the ſwiftneſs of leopards and hungry wolves ſwiftly ranging in the evening for prey; by the flight of eagles haſtening to their carnage, and the violent eaſt-wind devouring all obſtacles, and carrying away before it clouds of duſt, as the Chaldeans drove their flocks of captives. In ſhort, we have here the moſt exalted idea of God's attributes by the uſe of the figure proſopopœia *. In theſe ſacred volumes the mountains and foreſts do not only tremble, as in Homer, but melt like

* See Adventurer, vol. II. page 123, 173; and Pſ. xcvii. 5; xviii. 10; xcviii. 8; xcvi. 11; Nahum i. 5, to whom we owe the following inſtances.

wax

wax at the preſence of God. The God of the prophets doth not ride over the level waves, in a ſwift chariot, like Neptune, but comes flying upon the wings of the wind; while the floods clap their hands, and the hills and foreſts, and earth and heaven, all exult together before their Lord. In what uninſpired writer is the univerſal preſence of the Infinite Mind repreſented in ſo exalted a manner as in the divine poet? "Whither ſhall I "go from thy preſence? If I climb up into "heaven, thou art there! If I go down to "hell; lo! thou art there alſo. If I take "wings †, and fly toward the morning, or "remain in the uttermoſt parts of the weſt-"ern ocean; even there alſo thy right-hand "ſhall hold me."

† Our tranſlation ſtands thus: *If I take the wings of the morning, and fly to the uttermoſt parts of the ſea.* But *the wings of the morning* have nothing to do with what the Scripture calls *the uttermoſt ſea*, that is the Weſtern Ocean. Our poet in the original, and tranſlation of the LXX, continues an antitheſis with, "Though I fly to the fartheſt eaſt, where the morning firſt "dawns, to the utmoſt limits of the weſtern ocean."

The ſubjection of all created nature to the great Creator's will, is beautifully impreſſed on us by this *perſonification.* "To ſay that the "lightning obeyed the command, of God, "would of itſelf be ſufficiently ſublime; but "a Hebrew bard expreſſes this idea with far "greater energy and life: *Canſt thou ſend "lightings, that they may go, and ſay unto thee, "Here we are.* How animated! how em- "phatical is this unexpected anſwer,—HERE "WE ARE.— And how daring is this figure, "when DESTRUCTION and DEATH ſay (of "Wiſdom) *We have heard the fame thereof with "our ears.*" See Job xxviii. 22.

Permit me to add, from the *Adventurer* referred to, theſe excerpts out of the Scriptures. "The ſun riſing and breaking in upon the "ſhades of night, is compared to a bride- "groom iſſuing out of his chamber, in allu- "ſion to the Jewiſh cuſtom of uſhering the "bridegroom from his chamber at midnight, "with great ſolemnity and ſplendor, pre- "ceded by the light of innumerable lights "and torches. How is the divine favour "painted by the following ſimilitudes: *I*

"*will*

" *will be as the dew unto Judea. He ſhall grow up*
" *as a lilly. His branches ſhall ſpread, and his*
" *beauty ſhall be as the olive tree, and his ſmell like*
" *Mount Lebanon* †. — Not one of the Grecian
" poets has ſpoken ſo feelingly, ſo eloquently,
" or ſo elegantly of beauty, as the emperor
" Solomon of his miſtreſs or bride, in images
" perfectly original and new. *Thy hair*, ſays
" he, *is a flock of goats that appear from Mount*
" *Gilead*; where we may ſee her light-yellow
" treſſes wantoning by the wind around her
" neck. *Thy teeth are like a flock of ſheep, that are*
" *even ſhorn, which come up from the waſhing*; by
" which ſimilitude their exact equality, even-
" neſs and whiteneſs, are juſtly repreſented.
" *Thy neck is like the tower of David, builded for*
" *an armory*; *whereon there hang a thouſand buck-*
" *lers, all ſhields of mighty men*; that is, ſtraight
" and tall, adorned with golden chains and
" the richeſt jewels of the Eaſt. *Thy two breaſts*
" *are like two young roes, that are twins, which*
" *feed among the lillies*; the exquiſite elegance
" and propriety of which ſimilitude need not
" be pointed out, and cannot be excelled."

† See Hoſea xiv. 5.

I ſhall add only one compariſon, taken from Job, that our tranſlation may be illuſtrated. "My friends have dealt treacherouſly with "me. They are like torrents, which when "ſwoln and increaſed with winter-ſhowers, "promiſe great and unfailing plenty of wa- "ters; but, in the times of violent heats, "ſuddenly are parched up and diſappear. "The traveller in the deſarts of Arabia ſeeks "for them in vain. The troops of Sheba "looked, the caravans of Teme waited for "them. They came to the accuſtomed ſprings "for relief; they were confounded; they pe- "riſhed with thirſt."

To prove that the hiſtory contained in the Scriptures is the moſt remote, as well as moſt true, is needleſs; and, in the opinion of Cicero, would be culpable, ſince he juſtly thinks it blame-worthy to cite unneceſſary proofs upon ſubjects not at all diſputed; and the ſame obſervation will hold of the antiquity of its geography, and the morality of its doctrines. That it is full of Jewiſh old cuſtoms and idioms, I may elucidate by extracting only the ſeventeenth and eighteenth chapter

ter of Judges, where the account of Micah's ſetting up his images, and entertaining a prieſt in his houſe, ſeems, at firſt ſight, not very deſerving of record; and the other part of the relation is not only dark and abſtruſe, but conveys to the mind an uneaſy doubt, whether idolatry was not here unrebuked by God himſelf; ſince the Danites who carried away Micah's images, —in order to provide themſelves with a public worſhip,— were notwithſtanding proſperous in their enterprize.—— This part of Scripture is therefore certainly worthy of an examination; and amongſt many other diſſertations, which will branch out from the body of this compoſition, and which are intended to pleaſe the reader by their variety, will eſtabliſh theſe following points of ancient knowledge to us.

1. That the Jews, beſides their tabernacle, and, in later times, temple, had in every city and large town a ſynagogue; and in almoſt every village, and in ſome families of diſtinction, a *proſeucha* or praying-houſe.

2. A praying-houſe, as well as the temple, is in ſcripture-language ſtiled, "an houſe of "God."

3. Theſe praying-houſes were furniſhed ſomewhat in imitation of the tabernacle, afterwards the temple at Jeruſalem, according to the riches and ability of the village and family.

4. A Levite was generally the prieſt in thoſe proſeuchas, who wore an ephod of *linteum*, or common linen, though not of *byſſus*, or fine-twined linen.

5. A Levite in thoſe houſes was prieſt, but not a ſacrificing prieſt; and in the proſeucha was an altar or pillar, but not for ſacrifice. The altar was only a ſymbol, that the people, who met there to pray, were in allegiance to the God of heaven.

6. The Jews had a reaſonable opinion, that angels are converſant in an houſe of God, appointed by God, as good genii, to protect the wor-

worſhippers. Theſe angels are in Scripture ſometimes ſtiled Elohim; and ſometimes the One God only, in the ſingular number as to ſenſe, is ſtiled Elohim, according to the Eaſtern ſublimity of expreſſion.

CHAP. II.

A Digreſſion concerning Names.

BUT before we proceed with our proofs on theſe heads, we ſhall obſerve, that the man's name in the original, Judges xvii. 1, 4, is Michajehu, and Michah in other parts of the chapters; or Micah *, if you expreſs the Hebrew letter *caph* by *c* only. It is uſual, indeed, with the Hebrews, to alter names of men and places. 1. By addition of ſome paragogical † letter or letters. Thus Elijah in

* Caph pronunciatur ut χ Græcorum, vel *k* (ſive *c* durum) Anglorum. *Bennet's Heb. Gram.* p. 1. The Engliſh ſpelling, therefore, may ſtand, and I have followed it accordingly.

† Sex literæ א ה ו י נ ת ſunt paragogicæ, & fini vocum euphoniæ causâ ſæpe adduntur. *Buxtorf's Heb. Gram.* p. 4. To theſe we may add *mem*. Thus the city Laiſh, in Judges xviii. 27, is called Leſhem in Joſh. xix. 47. Theſe letters are not only added to the end, as it ſeems to be implied by the word paragogical, but to the beginning or middle of the word. The Rev. Dr. Kennicott, a man who really does an honour to

the

the original is generally Elijahu; Oſhea or Hoſhea, Deut. xxxii. 44, is new-named Joſhua or Jehoſhua, Numbers xiii. 16, which word ſignifies a *deliverer*, and denotes that he was appointed by God to deliver the Iſraelites from their natural enemies; whence twice in the New Teſtament, viz. in Acts vii. 45, and in Heb. iv. 9, he is called *Jeſus*; tho' for diſtinction's ſake, in my opinion, it would have been better to have tranſlated the word *Joſhua*, in thoſe places, leſt the ſhadow ſhould be taken, by common and inattentive minds, for the ſubſtance; the ſaviour of the Iſra-

his college, to his univerſity, to his country, to his age, and to learning itſelf, in his diſſertations entitled *The State of the printed Hebrew Text of the Old Teſtament conſidered*, has obſerved, (ſee Vol. I. page 24, 28, 36, 83,) that the letter Vau is often inſerted *in*, or dropt *from*, words in the ſacred writings. He obſerves alſo, an inſertion of Aleph; and of Jod it is evident in Michajehu inſtead of Micah; and thoſe other ſubſervient letters, by obſervation may poſſibly be found to be inſerted or dropt alſo. In theſe Diſſertations, which have already viſited a greater part of the known world, he has beyond the power of jangling contradiction proved, that very ſurpriſing errors have been introduced by copyiſts; and has demonſtrated many alterations to be only corruptions, occaſioned by the careleſsneſs of tranſcribers, who were often miſled by the ſimilitude in the formation of ſome Hebrew letters.

elites

elites for the Saviour of the world, or all the true Iſraelites of God. 2dly, By ſubtraction of a letter or letters, eſpecially the firſt. Thus Jeconiah, in Jer. xxii. 24, is named Coniah. 3dly, By putting one letter for another, where by chance errors have been introduced by the inadvertency of tranſcribers, and the great likeneſs of ſome Hebrew letters to one another. Thus Berodack, in 2 Kings xx. 12, is the ſame with Merodack, in Iſai. xxxix. 1. Nebuchadrezzar is the ſame man with Nebuchadnezzar; Ahimelech, 2 Sam. viii. 17, is the ſame with Abimelech, 1 Chron. viii. 16. 4thly, By the common change of vowels. Thus Uzziah, 2 Chron. xxvi. 1. Iſai. i. 1, is the ſame as Uzzah, 2 Kings xxi. 26, and is called Ozias, Matt. i. 8, and Azariah, 2 Kings xv. 1, and xiv. 21. 5thly, By tranſpoſition of letters. Thus Ammiel, 1 Chron. iii. 5. is the ſame as Eliam, 2 Sam. xi. 3.—I ſhall here preſent the reader with a ſhort table of men or women, who, through theſe cauſes, and their having two names (as will be hereafter proved) are mentioned in one place of Scripture by one of their names, and in another place by another, which he may enlarge at his own pleaſure;

ſure; only obſerving, that the difference of ſome of theſe names hath been occaſioned by the corruptions of heedleſs tranſcribers.

Ahaziah, 1 Chron. iii. 11,	is called	Azariah, 2 Chron. xxii. 6.
Amminadab, 1 Chr. vi. 22,		Izhar, 1 Chron. vi. 37, 38.
Araunah, 2 Sam. xxiv. 18,		Ornan, 1 Chron. xxi. 18.
Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 18, 19,		Carmi, 1 Chron. iv. 1.
Daniel, 1 Chron. iii. 1,		Chileab, 2 Sam. iii. 3.
Eſarhaddon, Ezr. iv. 2,		Aſnapper, Ezr. iv. 10.
Eſhbaal, 2 Chron. viii. 33,		Iſhboſheth, 2 Sam. ii. 8.
Gideon, Judges vii. 1.		Jerubbaal, Judg. vii. 1.
Jehoahaz, 2 Kings xxiii. 30,		Shallum, Jer. xxii. 11.
Jehoiakim, 1 Chron. iii. 15,		Eliakim, 2 Kings xxiii. 34.
Jethro, Exod. iii. 1,		Ruel, Exod. ii. 18. / Raguel, Numb. x. 29.
Joah, 1 Chron. vi. 20, 21,		Ethan, 1 Chron. vi. 42.
Joel, 2 Sam. viii. 2,		Vaſhni, 1 Chron. vi. 28.
Jozadar, 2 Kings xii. 21,		Zabad, 2 Chron. xxiv. 26.
Mephiboſheth, 2 Sam. iv. 4,		Meribbaal, 1 Chron. viii. 34.
Salmanaſſar, 2 Kin. xviii. 9,		Shalman, Hoſ. x. 14.
Sarah or Sarai, Gen. xi. 29,		Iſcah, Gen. xi. 29.
Sennacherib, 2 Ki. xviii. 13,		Sargon, Iſai. xx. 1.
Tamar, 2 Sam. xiv. 27,		Maacha, 1 Kings xv. 2.
Zedekiah, 2 Kings xxiv. 17, 1 Chron. iii. 15,		Mattaniah, 2 Ki. xxiv. 17.
Zerubbabel, Ezr. v. ii,		Sheſhbazzar, Ezr. v. 14, 16.
Zimri, 1 Chron. ii. 6,		Zabdi, Joſh. vii. 1.

It is evident alſo that the Jews gave two or three names to every perſon of note. Thus, Act i. 23, we read of Joſeph who was called Barſabas, and ſurnamed Juſtus; that is, he was known by the name of Joſeph Barſabas Juſtus. Joſeph was the name, *nomen*, given to him probably at his circumciſion; Barſabas the family-name, which he derived from his

his father, viz. his *agnomen*; and Juſtus was his ſurname or *cognomen*, given generally from ſome quality of the man, or accident of life. Some men had a great many of theſe ſurnames: thus Solomon was called Jedidjah, or Favourite of God, 2 Sam. xii. 25. Lemuel, or a Man taught of God, Prov. xxxi. 1, as learned men agree upon the place. Choheleth, or the Preacher, Eccl. i. 1. Yea, ſome will have him to be Agur, Prov. xxx. 1, that is, *a man collected* or *recovered* from his idolatry, into which he had been drawn aſide; and in ſuch caſe his mother is called Jakah, from her *obedience* to him, and *gathering* of him to her by prudent counſels, which ſhe is ſuppoſed to give in the next chapter. There was alſo among the diſciples of Chriſt, Judas Iſcariot: another diſciple was called Thomas Didymus, John xi. 16, and xx. 24. If we compare the names of the apoſtles in Matt. x. 2, 3, 4, and Acts i. 13, we ſhall find that Simon the Canaanite was called Simon Zelotes; and that Judas the brother of James was called Lebbeus, and ſurnamed alſo Thaddeus; and yet he is mentioned by his *name* Judas *only* in one of the places, and by Lebbeus

beus Thaddeus in the other. Hence it beyond contradiction appears, that in two different places of Scripture, the ſame man is ſometimes mentioned by different names.—If we compare Matt. ix. 9, and Mark ii. 14, we ſhall find that the ſame man was called Matthew and Levi. *And as Jeſus paſſed forth from thence, he ſaw a man named Matthew ſitting at the receipt of cuſtom; and he ſaith unto him, Follow me; and he aroſe and followed him. And it came to paſs as he ſat at meat in his houſe*, &c. Matt. ix. 9, 10. *And, as he paſſed by, he ſaw Levi the ſon of Alpheus ſitting at the receipt of cuſtom, and ſaid unto him, Follow me. And he aroſe and followed him. And it came to paſs, that as Jeſus ſat at meat in his houſe*, &c. Mark ii. 14, 15.— All men confeſs, and indeed it is ſelf-apparent on a ſlight compariſon, that St. Mark's Goſpel is barely an abridgment of that of St. Matthew. That the tranſaction recorded by theſe two Evangeliſts in the above-cited places, is one and the ſame, is as clear as circumſtances can make any thing whatever.— In each Evangeliſt the *perſon* ſits at the receipt of cuſtom, who is called to be a diſciple immediately after our Saviour's

curing a man of the palſy. This *perſon* in *each* is a publican, who provides a dinner, where many publicans are preſent. The ſame reflection is made by the Phariſees in each place, and the ſame anſwer retorted on them. It muſt be therefore very certain, that Matthew was called Levi, and mentioned by one of his names in one place of Scripture, and by his other name in another.

Again, almoſt all learned men agree, that Bartholomew the Apoſtle was Nathaniel *the Iſraelite, in whom was no guile*, John i. 47. And in this aſſertion they are ſtrongly authoriſed, not only by his being peculiarly called, as all the choſen diſciples of Chriſt were; but alſo by John xxi. 2, where Nathaniel by name is reckoned *amongſt theſe choſen diſciples*. Indeed we do not always read both theſe names; but, whenever it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh them from others, the diſtinguiſhing name is generally added. I may obſerve alſo, that as *Bar* is the Chaldee-Hebrew word for *ſon*, it is probable that words beginning with *Bar* may be the

the family-name, in the same manner as words beginning with *mac* are in Scotland and Ireland, or words ending with *son* are in England, in Johnson, Richardson, Williamson, Harrison, &c. Hence we may well allow that the last mentioned apostle was called Nathaniel Bartholomew. In this manner we read Acts xv. 22, of Judas Barsabas, who is thereby distinguished from Judas Iscariot, as well as from Judas Lebbeus Thaddeus. In the same manner we find that Simon, afterwards surnamed Peter, was called Simon Barjona, to distinguish him from the other disciple called Simon Zelotes.— This custom also was very ancient; for Josephus expressly tells us, that *Jethro* §, the father-in-law of Moses, Exod. iii. 1, or (as he renders it in his Greek expression) *Jetheglæus*, was the *surname* of Raguel or Reuel, Exod. ii. 18; or by chance the *family-name*, since ἐπίκλημα properly signifies a name super-added to the former, whether surname or family-name. From these proofs it is put beyond

§ Παρὰ τῷ Ἰεθιγλαίῳ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ἐπίκλημα τῷ Ραγουηλῳ. Jud. Antiq. Lib. 2.

all diſpute, that Jewiſh men and women had ſometimes, if not always, two or more names; and that it is uſual in the Jewiſh inſpired writers, to mention the ſame perſon ſometimes by one name, and ſometimes by another; and of conſequence that we have one key for reſolving ſome recondite places of Scripture.

In Mark ii. 25, 26, we have theſe words: *Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred? How he went into the houſe of God, in the days of Abiathar the high-prieſt, and did eat the ſhew-bread.*—But we ſee in 1 Sam. xxi. 1, and the following verſes, that *Abimelech* was at that time high-prieſt. —This ſeeming inconſiſtency will vaniſh at once, by allowing, as we may well do, that the high-prieſt was called *Abimelech Abiathar*, and that therefore his ſon, 1 Sam. xxii. 20, had the name of his father given to him; which cuſtom was as uſual to the Jews as with us, who gave to their children, and aſſumed when men, the names of their neareſt relations; as we may ſee in Luke i. 59, 60, 61, and in 1 Eſdras v. 38, where we read that

that Addus married Augia, one of the daughters of Berzerus, and then took the name of his father-in-law. Our Saviour in the place cited did nothing unuſual when he called the high-prieſt by one name, though he is mentioned in the book of Samuel by his other.

Again, there have been great diſputes, who that Zacharias, the ſon of Barachias, might be, who is mentioned in Matt. xxiii. 35, as a very righteous man, ſlain between the temple and the altar. Our Saviour by his mention of *Abel*, in conjunction with that Zacharias, ſeems to refer to ſome righteous man of that name, who is recorded in Scripture. Some think this righteous man to be Zacharias the father of John the Baptiſt, whom Baronius, from ſome doubtful authors, affirms to be ſlain by Herod for not delivering up his ſon when the infants were maſſacred. But this has ſcarce one degree of probability on its ſide; ſince this fact, being ſo important, would ſcarce have been paſſed over in ſilence by all the Evangeliſts, and becauſe this Zacharias the ſon of Bara-

chias is ſaid by Chriſt to be ſlain by the Jews, and not by Herod.

Our Dr. Hammond would have him to be Zacharias the ſon of Baruch, mentioned by Joſephus to be ſlain in the temple a little before the diſſolution of the Jewiſh nation and the deſtruction of the laſt temple. ——But this event mentioned by Joſephus happened after the death of Chriſt; whereas Chriſt himſelf ſpeaks not of a thing about to happen, but which had happened already.

Some others would have the man to be Zechary, the laſt but one of the twelve prophets, who, Zech. i. 1, is ſaid expreſsly to be the ſon of Barachiah; but many objections ariſe even here. For, 1ſt, this prophet ſeems to be juſt come from Babylon at the time of his propheſying. He propheſied in the ſecond year of Darius, about the time of the reſtoring of the Jews to their native land, and the rebuilding of the temple by Zorobabel, as the drift of the whole prophecy (ſee chap. ii. 7, and iv. 9, and Ezra v. 1.) declares: and though he might live to ſee the

the temple repaired, yet it is not probable that the Jews, ſo ſoon after their captivity, ſhould arrive to ſo great wickedneſs, as to kill God's prophet, who foretels nothing but enſuing proſperity to them; and, 2dly, we neither in Scripture, which, as we obſerved before, Chriſt ſeems here to refer to, nor in any ancient Jewiſh writer, can find that this prophet was put to death by the Jews.

The perſon marked out by our Saviour, therefore, ſeems to be Zechariah, the ſon of Jehoiada, mentioned in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, to have been ſlain by the Jews at the commandment of king Joaſh, *in the court of the houſe of the Lord*, flying doubtleſs towards the altar for protection. In ſuch caſe the name of Jehoiada, that worthy prieſt and zealous worſhipper of his God, was Jehoiada Barachiah; ſo that Barachiah was the family-name. He was the father of a good ſon, and probably of as good a grandſon, viz. of Zechariah, mentioned 2 Chron. xxvi. 5, to have *underſtanding in the viſions of God*, and whom Iſaiah, chap. viii. 2, calls the ſon of Jeberechiah. Indeed, it is probable that Ze-

chary the prophet, and by chance Zechary the father of John the Baptiſt, might be derived from this good family by a continual ſucceſſion in the prieſthood. Let us hear the account given us of this matter. *And the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the ſon of Jehoiada the prieſt, which ſtood above the people, and ſaid unto them, Thus ſaith God, Why tranſgreſs ye the commandments of the Lord, that ye cannot proſper? Becauſe ye have forſaken the Lord, he hath alſo forſaken you. And they conſpired againſt him, and ſtoned him with ſtones at the commandment of the king, in the court of the houſe of the Lord. Thus Joaſh the king remembered not the kindneſs which Jehoiada his father had done unto him, but ſlew his ſon. And when he died, he ſaid, The Lord look upon it, and require it.* 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21, 22. Thus Zechariah died in defence of the true worſhip of God, and therefore his blood may well be called *righteous*; and Our Saviour in the words cited, "that upon you may come all the "righteous blood," ſeems to refer to this holy man's laſt words: "The Lord look upon "it, and require it." Other obſervations of this kind may be made; but theſe are ſufficient

ficient to ſhew the uſefulneſs of ſuch a table, if properly conducted and explained throughout the Scriptures.

Another obſervation may ſtand thus. We have ſeen from 1 Eſdras v. 38, that it was uſual for the Jews to aſſume names, ſometimes when adult, from ſome kinſman; and from Gen. x. 25, we may collect that names were *ſometimes*, and in all probability *frequently* given and ſuperadded to the family name *of a man* from ſome great occurrence in *his* time; ſince one of Eber's ſons was called Peleg, which ſignifies as a verb, *he divided*, and as a noun, *a thing divided*, becauſe in his days the earth was divided. Hence ſome very ingenious men have with great ſhew of reaſon collected occurrences from the name. Adam, we read, had his name from the red earth from which he was created. Eve received her name, *becauſe ſhe was the mother of all living*. Eve, in her fooliſh pride, called her firſt-born ſon *Cain*, i. e. *acquiſition*, becauſe ſhe imagined that ſhe had *acquired a man from the Lord*: her notions of deity had not yet ſubſided; ſhe thought her ſon

ſon like that Divine Appearance which ſhe once ſaw in the garden; and that he was nothing leſs than an angel of God: or if God explained to Adam the redemption of man by the Meſſiah, as a ſacrifice for ſin, and ordered him to offer ſacrifices, as types of that great ſacrifice by faith in his meritorious death to come; then ſhe fondly ſuppoſed him to be the Meſſiah; for her words may be better tranſlated, *I have gotten the man the Lord.* She certainly ſuppoſed him to be the ſon of God, by a wanton pride, who was the ſon of the devil, and full of malice and murderous revenge. As ſhe thought ſo highly of her firſt-born ſon, ſo ſhe ſeems to have entertained poor notions of her ſecond ſon Abel, if we may judge by the ſignification of the name, which denotes *vanity*, or *evaneſcence.*——A full proof of that error which had after the fall poſſeſſed the human mind. ——But if we ſuppoſe that names were firſt impoſed characteriſtical of the man, and predictive of ſome great event, as all the Jewiſh writers, with St. Paul, univerſally explain them; then we muſt allow with Philo Judæus, that Cain had his name of *Acquiſition*, becauſe

becauſe he ſeemed to himſelf to have *acquired* all things, and that his own merits were ſelf-ſufficient; and that Abel was ſo called, becauſe he referred all things to God, conſidered himſelf as *vanity*, and his own offerings of no value without the atonement of the future ſacrifice. Hence *by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent ſacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witneſs that he was righteous, God teſtifying of his gifts, by which he being dead yet ſpeaketh, or preacheth.* Heb. xi. 4. — And what doth he preach?— but that men have been juſtified in the ſight of God, from the beginning of the world, by the blood of Chriſt. And in what manner did God teſtify that the gifts of Abel were accepted? — Why, *ſay the Jewiſh doctors, with great appearance of reaſon*, by the appearing of the great light upon his ſacrifice.— Abel offered a lamb for a ſin-offering, and ſhewed his humiliation; but Cain offered not from the firſt-fruits, but from fruits of inferior goodneſs, for a thankſgiving-offering, thinking his own merit ſelf-ſufficient to atone the Deity.

The

The name of Abel, as it ſignifies *evaneſcence*, ſhews alſo, that Abel ſhewed in a figure the death and ſhedding of the blood of Chriſt, as Seth, or *ſubſtitute*, raiſed in the place of Abel, prefigured the reſurrection and reviviſcence of Chriſt.

The next ſon of Cain mentioned is Enoch, or a *thing dedicated* to God, which implies that the divine worſhip was continued pure in his family. His ſon was Irad, which St. Jerom explains, *a city lying low*, or *deſcending*; which implies his *humiliation* alſo before God, if we ſuppoſe that names are characteriſtic of the man and times, as in general they certainly were. Mehujael, his ſon, is, by interpretation, *troubled of God*, and ſeems to intimate an introduction of idolatrous worſhip, and ſome divine puniſhment following it. His ſon's name *Methuſael* contains in it *death and the grave from God*, and implies a farther increaſe of idolatry, and a greater plague following it. Lamech implies in his name *conſumption*, and ſhews the troubles which the divine wrath had brought on the ground. This is the laſt father that is mentioned

tioned of the family of Cain, who married two wives, one called *Adal*, from *ornamental dreſs*, the other Zillah, from *witty converſation*. He begat three ſons, Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-cain; all which names ſeem derived from a word which ſignifies *to be worn out*, *to be conſumed*, and intimates that the family in them was diminiſhed by ſome diſorder, or conſumed by toil and ſtudy. Their ſiſter was called Naamah, viz. *beauty* and *harmony*, who ſeems to be the ante-diluvian Venus, as Tubal-cain was their Vulcan.

Men who are curious, may in the ſame manner carry along the family of Seth, whoſe firſt ſon was called Enos, which ſignifies *mortal man*, and ſhews that the family of Seth were conſcious of the diſmal effects of Adam's fall, and began to inſtitute publick worſhip and prayer to the true God. He is ſuppoſed to be the firſt patriarchal prieſt; for, Gen. iv. 26, in his time *began men to call upon the name of the Lord*. Hence began that diſtinction, that the deſcendants of Seth were called *ſons and daughters of God*, whereas the deſcendants of Cain were ſtiled

ſtiled *ſons and daughters of men*, becauſe the former maintained the worſhip of God more pure, even unto the days of another Lamech, when, by means of intermarriages, an univerſal idolatry had almoſt ſeized the world.

Idolatry being waſhed away by the univerſal deluge, the true religion was re-inſtated by Noah, and came down with great purity to Heber, who, according to the Jews, taught the Noachical precepts and divine laws with great exactneſs; for, as the learned *Francis Lee*, in his Diſſertations, vol. II. ſomewhere obſerves, the grandſon of Shem is called Salah, that is, *one ſent of God*. By him the prophetical or prieſtly college, where the precepts of Noah were taught, ſeems ſupported. Hence in the Arabic hiſtorians, and apocryphal pieces, he is called Sala, the *prophet of God*. The ſon of Sala was Heber, that is, a *pilgrim* or *paſſenger*; ſo that, in his name, Sala foretels that his ſeed ſhould *paſs over* Euphrates into Canaan; and as Shem, Gen. x. 21, is ſaid to *be the father of all the children of Heber*; and as *father* is, by Jewiſh writers,

writers, attributed to a *teacher* or *inſtructor*; it ſeems that all Heber's children were educated in the religion of Noah by the inſtitution of Shem. In the days of Peleg the ſon of Heber happened the confuſion of languages, and the general diſperſion or diviſion of lands; whence Heber, from whom the Hebrews took their name, ſeems to be the laſt man educated in, and a ſupporter of, the ſchool of Shem; tho' probably the worſhip of the one true God continued in that family to the days of Reu, the ſeventh in line from Noah, whoſe name may be interpreted *the breaking off*. Euſebius and Epiphanius ſay, the true religion began to be adulterated in the time of Serug the ſon of Reu. Serug ſignifies, *a thing entwiſted* into another. Serug's ſon was Nahor, which ſignifies *large noſtrils*, or *a full noſe*, and ſtands, by the ſymbolical characters of the Hebrews, for *patience* and *long forbearance*. By this name it looks as if the pure religion was much decayed, and God's patience exerciſed. Terah his ſon has the *moon* for the radix of his name. He by his attention to the heavenly bodies ſeems fallen into aſtral idolatry,

and probably from the aſcendency of Saturn at the birth of his ſon, might give him the name of Abram, or *high father*, prognoſticating that he would be ſome high doctor or great man; and if that ſuppoſition is true, it is not wonderful that God ſhould alter his name into Abraham, or the *father of multitudes*, by adding *He*, the letter, ſay the Jews, which imports fecundity. Abraham, amidſt this idolatry, ſeems to have ſtuck cloſe to the doctrines of Heber; whence he is called Abraham the Hebrew or Heberite, and the friend of God.

We may obſerve alſo, that fathers firſt built cities, and called them by the name of their ſon. Thus Cain, Gen. iv. 17, builded a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his ſon Enoch. In the ſame manner *Sichem* or *Shechem* was probably built by *Hamor*, who gave it its name from his ſon; whence it is ſtiled Gen. xxxiv. 20, *their* city; whereas before their time it is called *the place of Sichem*, Gen. xii. 6, or the place on which Sichem was afterwards built. This name is uſed then, wherever it occurs before

fore the days of Hamor, by the ſacred ſcribe, in the way of anticipation, that city being not before founded, though there might be a ſmall town; for all fortifiers or enlargers of towns are perpetually ſaid by the Eaſtern people to *build them:* hence when we read, 1 Kings xii. 25, that Jeroboam *built Shechem*, we muſt underſtand that he ſecured and enlarged the town.

Its name, which was given to the place or village by Abraham, was *Moreh*, or *Allon Moreh*, interpreted by our tranſlators, *the plain of Moreh*; by St. Hierom, *the illuſtrious vale* or *plain*; and by the Jeruſalem Targum, *the valley of viſion* (from רָאָה Raah, *he hath ſeen*); becauſe of the viſion of the glory of the Lord, which was there ſeen by Abraham, as ſoon as he came thither from Haran or Charran. Others render it *the oak of Moreh*, *the illuſtrious oak*, or *the high oak.* And it is more than probable, ſays the learned Dr. Lee, that there was in this place a very famous oak or tree of long duration, under which Joſhua afterwards erected a ſacred monumental pillar.

But how ſhall we reconcile this ſeeming contradiction between Gen. xxxiv. 26, 27, &c. where it is ſaid that Simeon and Levi, the ſons of Jacob, took the city and ſpoiled it, without the approbation of their father; and Gen. xlviii. 22, where Jacob himſelf is ſaid *to take the city out of the hands of the Amorite, with his ſword and his bow?*

To reconcile theſe places, we may note, that the ſons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, ſlew the males, and ſpoiled the city of Shechem. On this Jacob, with good reaſon, dreads an inſurrection of the people of the land; and though it is not expreſsly mentioned in the Scriptures, yet it plainly appears from this verſe, that the Amorites, or people belonging to king Hamor, ſeized the town after this maſſacre, and iſſued forth to revenge their king's injury on Jacob; but that Jacob came off victorious, and took the town by force of arms. Hence we ſee the reaſonableneſs of Dr. Kennicott's alteration in his Diſſertations, vol. I. page 59, wherein he turns the words, Gen. xlix. 6, *in their ſelf-will they digged down a wall, and in their fury they*

they deſtroyed the princes, viz. Hamor and Shechem. For if this account is truly ſtated, that Jacob took the town *himſelf by his ſword and his bow*; then it is evident that his ſons did not dig down the wall of it, except we imagine it to be built again by the Amorites in the intermediate time.

One very uſeful obſervation of an Hebrew idiom more I ſhall make, which I have not met with in any author. We may obſerve that, Gen. xlviii. 22, Jacob gave *Joſeph one portion above his brethern.* The word *Shechem* is the word there uſed in the original for *portion*, and was certainly alſo the name of that town delivered to him over and above the ſhare of his brethren. *The Hebrews made uſe of one word to ſerve a double end, to expreſs the name of a town or man, and at the ſame time, without repeating the word, to explain ſome other idea.* The words in Geneſis ſhould have been tranſlated thus, to expreſs the force of the original: *I have given thee Shechem, as one portion above thy brethren.* The Septuagint, who ſeem much more verſed in the original than our tranſlators, expreſs this

Hebrew idiom: Ἐγω δε διδωμι σοι Σικιμα ἐξαιρετον ὑπερ τους ἀδελφους σε· *I give thee Shechem, a chofen part, above thy brethren.*

This obfervation on a Hebrew idiom will enable us to explain an expreffion of St. Matthew, which deiftical men have greedily catched at. In Matt. ii. 23, we read, *And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was fpoken by the prophets, He fhall be called a Nazarene.* St. Matthew here, fays the deift, afferts a falfity; for the words, "He fhall be called a Naza-" rene," are not in any one prophet.

In order to clear this very knotty point, we muft remark, that the latter part of the verfe in the Hebrew St. Matthew of Sebaftian Munfter, and alfo in the Greek Teftament, has a word which is omitted in our tranflation; and which, by comparing the Hebrew and Greek words with each other, plainly fignifies, *becaufe*, or *inafmuch as*, ὁτι Ναζωραιος κληθησεται: *inafmuch as he would be called a Nazarene.* Our tranflation fhould therefore ftand thus; *And he came and dwelt*

dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that what was ſpoken by the prophets might be fulfilled, " inaſ-" much as he would be called a Nazarene." This alteration, agreeable both to the Greek and Hebrew, cuts off the whole force of the objection, by confining the prophecies to the ſingle word Nazarene.— Now the word Nazer or Netzer ſignifies, amongſt other things, *a branch,* and is the word uſed of the Meſſiah Iſai. xi. 1, *A branch* (Netzer) *ſhall grow out of his roots.* But St. Matthew, who knew the Hebrew idiom of comprehending both a name proper and appellative by one and the ſame word, obſerves only, that the town of Nazareth gave him a name characteriſtic of his being the true *Nazar,* or *Branch,* foretold by the prophets.

By this peculiarity of the Hebrew language, as Shechem in its full ſenſe, in the place cited, muſt be tranſlated both ways, if we would give, in our language, the full meaning deſigned by the inſpired writer; ſo the prophet Iſaiah may be tranſlated, *A Nazarene as a branch ſhall grow out of his roots;* though it is ſufficient to our purpoſe, that

the word *Nazarene* includes the ſignification of *Branch*, ſince that will juſtify St. Matthew by the Hebrew idiom of uſing names. In Jer. xxiii. 5, and xxxiii. 14, God promiſes to raiſe up a *righteous branch* unto David; and Zechariah vi. 12, propheſying of the Meſſiah, ſays, *Behold the man whoſe name is The Branch*; to which words the evangeliſt chiefly refers in theſe words, *inaſmuch as he would be called a Nazarene*, or *Branch*.——Inſtances we have of this double uſe of words in the Hebrew tongue. Thus, *Melchiſedec king of Salem*, is explained by St. Paul, by this Hebrew idiom, to be *king of righteouſneſs*, *king of peace*; and in that reſpect, as well as others, the apoſtle declares him to be a juſt type of the Meſſiah, inaſmuch as Hebrew names are characteriſtical of the man.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The Argument, and a New Tranſlation of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Chapters of Judges.

MICAH's mother, living at a diſtance from any place of public worſhip, had ſet aſide ſome money to build a *proſeucha* or houſe of prayer, and had bound her ſon under an oath to lay out the money in that uſe. Micah being allowed, as 'tis likely, to uſe her money as his own (ſince he would claim it by and by through right of inheritance), had taken it; but conſidering the obligation which he lay under, and being alſo himſelf willing to have her deſign performed, put her in mind of it, brings the money to her, and obtains her bleſſing. She then fully certified him of her deſign of giving it him (probably at her death), that he might provide the proper furniture for an houſe of prayer, in order to have the worſhip of the

true God kept up in their family and neighbourhood.—He having reſtored the money, ſhe herſelf employs a proper workman.—Being not able for the preſent to obtain a prieſt, Micah, through neceſſity, appoints one of his ſons, till a Levite came, when he joyfully entertained a regular prieſt according to the law of Moſes, and rejected his ſon. Some time after certain Danites paſſed that way, as ſpies of the part of the country yet unconquered. Theſe finding by the Levite, that Micah had an houſe of God, turned in to enquire about the event of their way, and obtained an anſwer of ſucceſs. Theſe Danites execute their commiſſion, return and acquaint their brethren with the condition of the land, and people who inhabited it, and undertake to conduct them to it.—The ſpies knowing that there was no houſe of God in the place which they were about to ſeize, inform their brethren about Micah's houſe of prayer. They all being willing to ſettle a divine worſhip amongſt themſelves, carried off with them the furniture of Micah's *proſeucha* and his prieſt, on this maxim, *That a leſſer good ought to give way*

to

to a greater; and accordingly conſtituted an houſe of God at Dan, formerly Laiſh.

CHAP. XVII. tranſlated.

Verſe 1. AND there was a man of mount Ephraim, whoſe name was Micah.

2 And he ſaid unto his mother, The eleven hundred ſhekels of ſilver that were taken by thee, and about which thou didſt oblige me in a moſt ſacred manner, and didſt alſo ſtrictly charge me; behold, the money is with me, I took it. And his mother ſaid, Bleſſed be thou of the Lord, my ſon.

3 And he reſtored the eleven hundred ſhekels of ſilver unto his mother; and his mother ſaid, I wholly dedicated the ſilver unto the Lord, for my ſon to make a *graven thing*, and a *molten thing*. Now therefore ſhall I return it unto thee?

4 So he reſtored the money unto his mother; and his mother took two hundred ſhekels of ſilver, and gave them to the founder, who made thereof a graven thing, and a molten thing, and they were in the houſe of Micah.

5 And

5 And the man Micah had an houſe of God, and made an ephod and teraphim, and conſecrated one of his ſons, who became his prieſt.

6 In thoſe days there was no governor in Iſrael; but every man did that which was right in his own eyes.

7 And there was a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, of the tribe of Judah, who was a Levite, and he ſojourned there.

8 And the man departed out of the city, even from Bethlehem-Judah, to ſojourn where he could find a place; and he came to mount Ephraim, to the houſe of Micah, as he travelled.

9 And Micah ſaid unto him, Whence comeſt thou? And he ſaid unto him, I am a Levite from Bethlehem-Judah, and I go to ſojourn where I ſhall find a place.

10 And Micah ſaid unto him, Dwell with me, and be unto me for a father and a prieſt; and I will give thee ten ſhekels of ſilver by the year, and a ſuit of apparel, and thy victuals. So the Levite went in.

11 And the Levite was content to dwell with the man, and the young man was with him.

12 And

12 And Micah consecrated the Levite, and the young man became his priest, and was in the house of Micah.

13 Then said Micah, Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest.

CHAP. XVIII. translated.

Verse 1 IN those days there was no governor in Israel: and in those days the tribe of the Danites sought them an inheritance to dwell in; for unto that day all their inheritance had not fallen unto them among the tribes of Israel.

2 And the children of Dan sent of their family five men from their coasts, men of valour, from Zorah and from Eshtaol, to spy out the land, and to search it; and they said unto them, Go, search the land; who when they came to mount Ephraim to the house of Micah, they lodged there.

3 When they were by the house of Micah, they knew the voice of the young man the Levite, and they turned in thither, and said unto

unto him, Who brought thee hither? and what doeſt thou in this place? and what haſt thou here?

4 And he ſaid unto them, Thus and thus dealeth Micah with me, and hath hired me, and I am his prieſt.

5 And they ſaid unto him, Aſk counſel, we pray thee, of God; that we may know, whether our way which we go, ſhall be proſperous.

6 And the prieſt ſaid, Go in peace. Before the Lord is the way which ye go.

7 Then the five men departed, and came to Laiſh, and ſaw the people that were therein; how they dwelt careleſs, after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and ſecure; and there was no magiſtrate in the land, that might put them to ſhame in any thing; and they were far from the Zidonians, and had no connexion with any man.

8 And they came unto their brethren, to Zorah and Eſhtaol; and their brethren ſaid unto them, What ſay ye?

9 And they ſaid, Ariſe, that we may go up againſt them, for we have ſeen the land, and

and behold, it is very good ; and are ye ſtill ?——Be not ſlothful to go, and to enter to poſſeſs the land.

10 When ye are come, ye ſhall come unto a people ſecure, and to a large land for you ; for God hath given it into your hands ; a place where there is no want of any thing that is in the earth.

11 And there went from thence of the family of the Danites out of Zorah and out of Eſhtaol ſix hundred men, furniſhed with weapons of war.

12 And they went up and pitched by Kirjath-jearim in Judah : wherefore they called that place Mahaneh-Dan unto this day.—Behold, it is behind Kirjath-jearim.

13 And they paſſed thence unto mount Ephraim, and came unto the houſe of Micah.

14 Then anſwered the five men that went to ſpy out the country of Laiſh, and ſaid unto their brethren, Do ye not know that there is in theſe houſes an ephod and teraphim, and a graven thing, and a molten thing ? Now therefore conſider what ye have to do.

15 And they turned thitherward, and they came to the houſe of the young man the Levite, even unto the houſe of Micah, and ſaluted it.

16 And the ſix hundred men furniſhed with their weapons of war, which were of the children of Dan, ſtood by the entering of the gate.

17 And the five men that went to ſpy out the land, went up and came in thither, and took the graven thing, and the ephod, and the teraphim, and the molten thing; and the prieſt ſtood at the entering of the gate with the ſix hundred men that were furniſhed with weapons of war.

18 But theſe (*five*) men went into Micah's houſe, and fetched the carved thing, the ephod, and teraphim, and the molten thing. Then ſaid the prieſt unto them, What do ye?

19 And they ſaid unto him; Hold thy peace, lay thy hand upon thy mouth, and go with us, and be to us a father and a prieſt. Is it better for thee to be a prieſt unto the houſe of one man, or that thou be

be a prieſt unto a tribe and a family in Iſrael?

20 And the prieſt's heart was glad, and he took the ephod, and the teraphim, and the graven thing, and went in the midſt of the company.

21 So they turned and went their way, and put the youth, and what they had gotten, and the precious things, before them.

22 And when they were a good way from the houſe of Micah, the men that were in the houſes near to Micah's houſe were called together, and followed after the children of Dan.

23 And they called out unto the children of Dan, and they turned their faces, and ſaid unto Micah, What aileth thee, that thou comeſt with ſuch a company?

24 And he ſaid, Ye have taken away my divine furniture which I had prepared, and the prieſt, and ye are going away. — And what have I left? And yet ye ſay unto me, What aileth thee?

25 And the children of Dan ſaid unto him, Let not thy voice be heard among us, leſt men

men of paſſionate minds fall upon thee, and thou loſe thy life, with the lives of thy houſhold.

26 And the children of Dan went their way; and when Micah ſaw they were too ſtrong for him, he turned and went back unto his houſe.

27 And they took the things which Micah had made, and the prieſt which he had, and came unto Laiſh, unto a people that was at quiet, and ſecure; and they ſmote them with the edge of the ſword, and burnt the city with fire.

28 And there was no deliverer, becauſe it was far from Zidon, and they had no connection with any man; and it was in the valley that lieth by Beth-rehod; and they built a city, and dwelt therein.

29 And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, who was born unto Iſrael. Howbeit the name of the city was Laiſh at the firſt.

30 And the children of Dan ſet up the graven thing; and Jonathan the ſon of Gerſhom, the ſon of Moſes, he and his ſons were

were prieſts to the tribe of Dan, until the days of the captivity of the land.

31 And they ſet up Micah's carved thing which he had made, all the time that the houſe of God was in Shiloh.

CHAP. IV.

The Chronology of this Hiſtory.

CHronology and geography are allowed to be the two eyes of hiſtory. The time, in which theſe things of Micah and the Danites were tranſacted, evidently appears to be ſhortly after the death of Joſhua, about the year of the world 2500, or 1460 years before Chriſt, by theſe reaſons.

1. The tabernacle of God is ſaid to be ſet up at Shiloh, Joſh. xviii. 1, and then Joſhua ſets about the diviſion of the land to the ſeveral tribes. In this diviſion the lot of the tribe of the children of Dan is reckoned up, Joſh. xix. 40; and this expedition of the Danites is mentioned verſe 47, as if it followed ſoon after.

2. When it is ſaid that the Levite, whoſe name probably was Jonathan, Judg. xviii. 30, and his ſons were prieſts *all the time that the houſe of God was in Shiloh*, it looks as if the firſt ſetting up of the tabernacle was then in view.

3. Since the Danites ſent ſpies, it appears that they had not been long enough in the land to be acquainted with it; and therefore that this muſt happen ſoon after their ſettlement.

4. We read in Judg. i. 3, 22, 23, 24, &c. that, immediately after Joſhua's death, each tribe for himſelf was endeavouring to ſubdue that part of the people belonging to the country allotted them by Joſhua, which remained yet unconquered, and alſo that ſpies were commonly ſent. This expedition of the Danites therefore was of the ſame nature, and doubtleſs made in the ſame time; and ſo this relation ſhould follow in order of time after the firſt chapter of Judges.—Indeed, in many places of the ſacred writings there is a tranſpoſing of relations; and

that is ſometimes placed firſt, which is done laſt. To this purpoſe the Hebrew doctors have long ſince pronounced that there is neither BEFORE nor AFTER in the law. Things are not related in Scripture according to regular ſucceſſion of time.

Now, whereas it is ſaid that this Jonathan and his ſon were prieſts to the tribe of Dan, until the day of the *captivity* of the land, and it has been diſputed what captivity of the land is here meant; it is to me clear, from the laſt verſe of the chapter, that it implies the carrying away of the people, and the taking of the ark by the Philiſtines, when it had been fetched from Shiloh into the camp, in the laſt day of the life of Eli; which happened in the year of the world 2850, or 1110 years before Chriſt. For *the poſterity of Jonathan were prieſts until the captivity of the land, and Micah's furniture was in their praying-houſe, while the ark of God was in Shiloh*, are expreſſions which refer to the ſame time. This taking of the ark the Pſalmiſt alſo expreſsly calls *a captivity*, in Pſ. lxxviii. 60, 61. *He forſook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he placed*

placed among men; and delivered his ſtrength into captivity, *and his glory into the enemies hands.*

COROLLARY.

Since this affair happened probably in the next year after the death of Joſhua, and Joſhua was co-temporary with Moſes, and Gerſhon the ſon of Moſes may be proved younger than Joſhua; it is reaſonable to think, that this Jonathan was the very ſon of Gerſhon, and not one of his deſcendants at a diſtance, as Grotius will have it.—And here I ſhall juſt take notice of one alteration which I have made in the tranſlation, and obſerve the reſt as they happen to fall in my way; ſince a long diſſertation, or notes, on that head would appear too formal and dry to thoſe men, who reliſh only the pleaſureable part of writing, though men of critical diſpoſitions can digeſt the uſeful only. — I have in chap. xviii. 30, turned *Manaſſeh* into *Moſes*, for theſe reaſons.

1. Becauſe in manuſcripts, yea in Hebrew editions, the letter *n* in *Manaſſes* is ſuſpended as a ſuſpicious letter. In Arias Montanus it is printed thus מ֯שה. If you take off that letter, the word in Hebrew becomes Moſes.

2. Becauſe the Maſorites amongſt the Jews rejected it, and aſſerted that *Moſes*, not *Manaſſes*, is the right reading.

3. Becauſe the alteration makes Scripture agree with Scripture; for in Exod. ii. 22, and xviii. 8, and 1 Chron. xxvi. 24, Gerſhon is ſaid to be the ſon of Moſes.

4. Becauſe by the old tranſlation a prieſt is derived from Manaſſes, contrary to God's commandment, who confined the prieſthood to the tribe of Levi.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

A Digreſſion concerning Inſertions in the Scriptures by Scribes.

THE Danites at this time *after Joſhua's death* had not obtained all the lot which Joſhua aſſigned them, and ſent thoſe ſpies. And ſince this happened *after the death of Joſhua*, we may find a *full* proof, though hitherto, as I imagine, un-noticed by any author, that *ſome part at leaſt* of the book of Joſhua was not written until ſome time after his death, but probably was compoſed by the ſame perſon who wrote the book of *Judges*. This expedition of the Danites happened after the death of Joſhua: *There was then no governor in Iſrael.* In verſe 6 of the xviith chapter, and verſe 1 of the viiith chapter, I have turned the word *king* into *governor*, becauſe kingly power had not yet been ſettled in the Jewiſh ſtate; but the go-

vernment under God, or in ſubordination to God, was in the hands of a judge, who here, and in the 1ſt verſe of the xixth chapter, and the 25th verſe of the xxiſt chapter, is called *governor*. GOD properly was their king, and in a manner viſibly ruled over them. Under GOD was the judge, as a deputy-governor, joined generally with the high-prieſt; and ſometimes, as in Eli, the offices of judge and high-prieſt were inveſted in the ſame man. Theſe the people were ordered by GOD, Deut. xvii. 12, to obey under penalty of death. The judge had a dictatorial power under GOD; he was GOD's vicegerent.—The Carthaginians, who ſprung from the Phenicians, called their rulers or conſuls *ſufetes* or *ſufetes*, from the Hebrew name of theſe judges, viz. *Sophetim*. From this kingly power, which God exerciſed by theſe judges, God tells Samuel, that the Iſraelites who requeſted to have a king, *had not rejected him*, viz. Samuel, but had rejected *God himſelf that he ſhould not rule over them*. Samuel was governor only under God, and conſequently was not king in his own right.—But at preſent there was a ſort of interregnum.

regnum. — Joſhua was dead, and no new judge eſtabliſhed in his room. Now the book of Joſhua, at leaſt a part, muſt be written after this expedition, ſince this ſame is recorded in Joſhua, chap. xix. verſe 47, where *Laiſh* is called *Leſhem*. — So that Mr. Mede has reaſon for *his opinion*, that the book of Joſhua was written after his death. — In my judgment, every judge was generally a prophet; and every prophet, from the firſt to the laſt, from Moſes to Malachi, wrote exact records of his own time, under the guidance of God's holy ſpirit. Hence there were not only the chronicles of the kings of Judah written by the prophets in their days, which are ſo often referred to, and a ſhort extract of which we have, but other hiſtorical writings of the prophets. That theſe records were made by the inſpired prophets, we may learn from St. Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 16; but more plainly in 1 Chron. xxix. 29, where we ſee that the prophets *Samuel*, *Nathan*, and *Gad*, were the hiſtoriographers of David †. One of theſe, viz. either Nathan or

† See alſo 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, where the life of Manaſſes is recorded in the ſayings of the ſeers, i. e. in the writings of the Gad,

Gad, I think, had the name of *Jaſher*, or *upright man*, aſſigned to him; who is mentioned in 2 Samuel i. 18, as an hiſtorian of David; who recorded that David firſt taught the children of Iſrael the uſe of the bow; probably on account of the Philiſtines having galled Saul's troops with their arrows at a diſtance, and by that means, in human judgment, gaining the victory. David not only lamented the loſs of his ſincere friend Jonathan, as well as his ſtout father in the battle; but, in order to ſet the Iſraelites on an equal advantage with their enemies, taught them an improvement of the uſe of the bow. And this piece of his generalſhip is mentioned in the book of Jaſher, who was plainly therefore an hiſtoriographer of David. Now Samuel was dead before this occurrence, and Gad is little mentioned in this early part of David's life; and therefore Nathan ſeems to be the man, though mentioned by his other name, which thing we have already proved

prophets; though Arias Montanus for *ſeers* puts Hozai, a proper name of a prophet, whoſe Prayer of Manaſſes is yet extant, and who is ſuppoſed to be Ezra by ſome. Our tranſlation, as I think, is right.

to

to be very uſual in Scripture. — From theſe hiſtories thus written, under the guidance of God's ſpirit, the Bible ſeems to have been compiled by ſome ſcribes faithfully comparing theſe inſpired records, and making juſt extracts from them; and ſometimes — to illuſtrate or compleat any relation,— inſerting ſome pieces of genealogy or hiſtory from other records, though of a much later date, yet equally authentic.

This book of Jaſher, indeed, is referred to in Joſh. xviii. 13. but the reference is not in the Greek verſion, and therefore ſeems to have no proper right to be there. However, if we ſuppoſe that Nathan, or whoever wrote the book of the *Juſt Man*, took notice of the event there recorded; it muſt then be granted, that the ſcribes did make theſe remarks in their tranſcribing, which I have mentioned; ſince the author of this book muſt be alive *in* or *after* the days of David, and write *in* or *after* his time; and therefore the perſon who cites that book muſt live *in* or *after* that time alſo; ſince no man ſurely can cite a paſſage from a book, who lives before

before the book is written.— Neither doth this obſervation, as I have ſtated it, derogate from, but confirms the ſacred authority of the Scriptures; ſince, on this ſuppoſition, they muſt be all taken from the writings of inſpired men by the greateſt care of tranſcribers, to whom every little error is imputable; for I no where find the ſcribes repreſented as inſpired men, or inveſted with infallibility. — Whoever ſhall read over the Scriptures, will pardon me for my opinion, if not aſſent to it. I ſhall deſire, however, to explain my ſenſe to be this: *That theſe tranſcribers did not vary a word from the very expreſſions of the prophets*; *but only inſerted from other records ſome remarks to illuſtrate or perfect any volume.* This is the middle way between two contending parties; one of which will not allow it neceſſary for *Moſes* to be the writer of any part of his *Pentateuch* in the very ſame words in which we now read it, but only that ſome ſcribe expreſſed his exact ſenſe; and the other will not admit of one ſyllable being inſerted by any other hand. Now I believe, that it will be eaſily granted that truth generally lies in the middle between warm polemical

mical writers.— As for my part, I verily believe that the books of Moſes were tranſcribed from his own writings in the very ſame words; ſo that in the moſt literal ſenſe it is true, which is aſſerted in Deut. xxxi. 9, that *Moſes wrote this law, and delivered it unto the prieſts, the ſons of Levi, who bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord*; and verſe 24, that *Moſes made an end of writing the words of the law in a book, until they were finiſhed; and that he commanded the Levites to take this law, and put it in the ſide of the ark of the covenant of the Lord their GOD.*— It ſeems almoſt certain that by the word *law* here are meant the five books of Moſes; ſince their *law*, Deut. xvii. 19, 20, contained all the ſtatutes of the Lord, both moral and ceremonial, and therefore is ordered by God to be read by *kings*, or rather in that place, as well as in thoſe places of *Judges*, by *governors*, all the days of their life, for the guidance of their lives and ſtate. This book of the law of the LORD given by Moſes was found in the houſe of the Lord by Hilkiah, in the days of Joſiah, 2 Chron. xxxiv. This law God ordered Joſhua to meditate

meditate in day and night. This ſame law of Moſes Joſhua recommended to the Iſraelites, and David very fully to his ſon Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 3. *Keep the charge of the Lord thy God to walk in his ways, to keep his ſtatutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his teſtimonies, as it is written in the law of Moſes.*—But, to mention no more proofs, Our Saviour, we know, divides the Old Teſtament into the *law* and *prophets*; where by *law*, are manifeſtly meant the five books of Moſes. It is therefore proved beyond diſpute, in my opinion, that the ſcribe copied the books of Moſes from his very identical words.—But though this may be well granted, yet I think that it muſt be allowed that Joſhua, or Ezra †, who is ſaid, Ezra vii. 6, 11, 12, or

† This Ezra certainly tranſcribed the whole law and prophets, and ſealed up the canon of the Jewiſh Scriptures. He delivered alſo, in great probability, ſome *apocryphal* books to the Jewiſh Sanhedrim, *ſo called* becauſe they were kept from the inſpection of the people, who were ſuppoſed incapable of taking their ſpiritual meaning. Of this kind might be the ſecond book of Eſdras, if it could be ſtript of thoſe interpolations and corruptions which appear in it. He is ſuppoſed

as

as ſome men will have it, Eſdras (which men ſuppoſe him different from Ezra, though in my opinion Eſdras and Ezra are two names for the ſame man), added the laſt chapter of Deuteronomy, either from inſpired record, or by the inſpiration of God, concerning the death and burial of Moſes. To the ſame

alſo to have compoſed the book of Eſther and the two books of Chronicles from ſome ſacred memoirs, which he preſerved, as he was the public regiſter and chancellor of the nation. He eſtabliſhed ſome *conſtitutions* about public prayer, in which he introduced at the end of each prayer, *men havolim war havolim*, i. e. *from world to world*; *from this world to the next*; having received the true faith of the reſurrection of the dead from the divine word, as we may ſee 2 Eſd. vii. 28, 29, &c. whence it appears that the unadulterated part of this book has true tokens of divine inſpiration, and ſeems to be the book referred to by Chriſt, under the name of the *Wiſdom of God* (ſee Luke ii. 49, 2 Eſd. i. 30, 31, 32,), in imitation of other ſapiential or ſophical books, ſtiled *The Wiſdom of Solomon*, and *The Wiſdom of Jeſus the Son of Sirach*; and was kept probably amongſt thoſe cryptical and cabbaliſtical books, which were read only by their wiſe men and maſters, who were admitted within the veil of Moſes to perceive the ſpiritual meanings of the law. His *Conſtitutions* alſo ſettled the reading and interpreting the Scriptures; the magiſtrates and judges; the prieſts and Levites, with their courſes and offices, according to the methods of David and Solomon; and alſo the ſchools; about all which ſee the learned Francis Lee, vol. I.

hand

hand we may allow the catalogue of Edomite kings, declared to be carried on to Saul the firſt king of Iſrael in Gen. xxxvi. 31, and 1 Chron. i. 43, 51. To the ſame is due the remark concerning the bedſtead of Og, king of Baſhan, Deut. iii. 11; and that expreſſion taken out of *the Book of the Wars of the Lord*, mentioned in Numb. xxi. 14, 15. Theſe inſertions taken out of other authentic records, for the greater clearneſs and perfectneſs of relating, render a book only more valuable.—In the ſame manner we may well allow that ſome ſcribe inſerted in the book of Joſhua the account of the expedition of the Danites, ſince it happened after the death of Joſhua. The obſervation of David's teaching the children of Iſrael the uſe of the bow, manifeſtly breaks in in an abrupt way, and claims the ſame origin. The ſcribe indeed ſometimes acquaints us when the words of the prophet are ended, and conſequently that the remainder belongs to ſome other hand. Thus Jer. li. 64, *Thus far are the words of Jeremiah.* In the next chapter, therefore, that writer from ſome inſpired record

cord gives a ſhort hiſtory of the accompliſhment of ſome of the foregoing prophecies of the book. This is my opinion of the writing of the Scriptures; but I ſhall leave, as it becomes me, the free deciſion of this thing to men of ſuperior judgment.

CHAP. VI.

The Topography.

IN describing the places mentioned in these chapters, I shall take them in the order in which they lay in this relation; and we first arrive, verse 1, at mount Ephraim.

Mount Ephraim, in the tribe of Ephraim, is a chain of hills about nine miles in length; but a tract of land for some considerable breadth on each side the hill, was certainly included under that denomination. This will appear, if we observe from Josh. xvii. 15, that it was at first the designed, though afterwards found an insufficient, allotment for the whole tribe of Ephraim.

Jacob propheſies, Gen. xlix. 22, that *Joseph would be a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches run over the wall*;

wall; and this prophecy chiefly refers to *Ephraim*, which, Gen. xli. 52, in Hebrew ſignifies *fruitful*. Jacob gave Joſeph two portions, Ezek. xlvii. 13, aſſigning one for each of his ſons; and Joſephus tells us, in his *Antiquities*, book iii. chap. 11, that *Manaſſes his eldeſt ſon was taken in for a tribe inſtead of Levi, and Ephraim inſtead of Joſeph.*—This ſhews that *Ephraim* was chiefly intended by the prophecy under the word *Joſeph*: and the event fully verified the prediction; ſince Ephraim arrived to that greatneſs, that the ten tribes of Iſrael are ſometimes denominated in Scripture by the ſingle name of *Ephraim*. Thus in Jerem. xxxi. 20, *Is Ephraim my dear ſon?* Thus when Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah, the ſon of Remaliah, king of Iſrael, Iſa. vii. 1, 2, conſpired againſt Judah, *It was told the houſe of David, ſaying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim*, i. e. with Iſrael.—You may ſee more inſtances in Hoſh. vi. 4, and clearly in 2 Chron. xxv. 7, where *Iſrael* is explained by *all the children of Ephraim*. As to the fruitfulneſs of the tribe, we read that at Mount Sinai, Numb. i. 3, 4, *Of the children of Joſeph, namely, of the children of Ephraim*

were numbered forty thouſand and five hundred fighting men : and when theſe were all dead, excepting Joſhua, in the wilderneſs; yet ſtill thirty-two thouſand five hundred went in, Numb. xxvi. 37, with Joſhua, to take their portion in the Land of Promiſe. Now as each of theſe men was a maſter of a family, we may ſee that under *Mount Ephraim* muſt be included the adjacent towns on each ſide; ſince a thin group of hills of nine miles in length only, could not afford room ſufficient for the habitation and ſuſtenance of ſo many families. Amongſt theſe adjoining towns, under the name of Mount Ephraim, we find, beſides Micah's houſe, the town Timnath-ſerah allotted to Joſhua for his portion, Joſh. xix. 20; Shechem, allotted to the Levites the children of Kohath, Joſh. xxi. 21, the reſidence of the propheteſs, ſhe-judge, and warrior, Deborah, Judg. iv. 5; and the town Ramathaim-Zophim, ſo called from Zophim, one of the hills of Mount Ephraim, which is otherwiſe called *Rama*, *Ramath*, and *Arimathea*, where Samuel was born and buried, and where Joſeph lived who buried Our Saviour.

2. Beth-

2. Bethlehem-Judah, from which the travelling Levite came, next preſents itſelf, Judg. xvii. 7.—The learned *Lewis*, in his *Hebrew Antiquities*, vol. I. chap. xii. ſeems to think, that the Levites in *David*'s time were firſt divided into *templar* and *provincial* Levites. But it appears here, that long before David, immediately after the ſettlement of the Iſraelites in the Holy Land, the Levites were divided into Levites attending on the tabernacle, afterwards the temple, and Levites diſperſed thro' the provinces.—A modern writer treats our Levite as a renegado, not conſidering that the very requeſt of Micah and the Danites to him, fully proves it cuſtomary to entertain Levites in their houſes of prayer at that time. Yea, we may obſerve, that *father* was a title given by the Jews to thoſe provincial Levites who ſerved in their houſes of prayer, from their authority *over*, and tender care and *inſtruction of*, the family in which they lived; and that it was an antient Jewiſh cuſtom for maſters of houſes, where the tithes could not maintain the Levite, to endow themſelves their chapel of eaſe; or, which is the ſame, to pay by agreement an annual ſalary. We

may alſo obſerve, that ſince thoſe Danites knew the Levite only by his voice, before they entered the houſe, Judg. xviii. 3, that it is more manifeſt that he was one of the provincial travelling Levites, *who went to ſojourn and ſettle in whatever place he might meet with*, ὃς ἐπορεύθη παροικῆσαι ἐν ᾧ ἐὰν εὑρῃ τοπῳ. Judg. xvii. 8. — It is evident that he had been before that time amongſt thoſe Danites.—Does it not appear from theſe words, *Micah hath hired me, and I am his prieſt*, that it was cuſtomary to hire prieſts in thoſe days? Why elſe ſhould he ſojourn in order to find ſuch an houſe, if it was not uſual in thoſe days to hire thoſe travelling Levites to be prieſts? —But as we ſhall conſider that more largely by and by, we will return to the town, and obſerve, that there were two towns by the name of Bethlehem (or Bethlechem, i. e. the Houſe of Bread, as predictive of the true bread, which ſhould there come down from heaven); one in the tribe of Zebulun, Joſh. xix. 15, in Lower Galilee; and another in the tribe of Judah, in the diſtrict of Ephrata; for Ephrata contained not only the town, but the adjoining grounds.

We

We read in Gen. xxxv. 16, of the city Ephrath in the days of Jacob; and we are told in verſe 19, that Ephrath is the ſame city with *Bethlehem*. Here is another inſtance of an explanation given by the ſcribe, who alſo, in Gen. xlviii. 7, informs us, that the old city Ephrath, near which Rachel died, was the ſame city as was afterwards called Bethlehem. Ephrath, or Ephrata, ſeems ſo named by Caleb the ſon of Hur, 1 Chron. ii. 50, (which Hur is, Joſh. xv. 13, called, by his other name, Jephunneh) to continue the name of his grand-father Ephrata; and probably took the name of Bethlehem from his grandſon of that name, 1 Chron. ii. 50, 51, 54. Some indeed think that Caleb gave the name of his wife, 1 Chron. ii. 19, to the city.—But if the name was affixed at all by Caleb, it muſt have been inſerted by the ſcribe in Gen. xxxv. 19, or from ſome explanation in the margin; ſince the name was in ſuch caſe affixed after the death of Moſes, and probably of Joſhua; and hence the city Bethlehem is not mentioned in Joſhua amongſt the cities aſſigned to the tribe of Judah. —— We ſee here alſo that David is

rightly ſaid, 1 Sam. xvii. 12, to be the ſon of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whoſe name was Jeſſe.

The term *Judah* is here, therefore, annexed to Bethlehem, to diſtinguiſh this town, from which the Levite came, from the other town of the ſame name. Hence in Judg. xvii. 7, I have turned the words, *of the family of Judah*, into *of the tribe of Judah*, becauſe the words ought to be referred to the town, and not to the Levite. No prieſt, till the prieſthood was changed in Chriſt, was made from the tribe of Judah. — The Hebrew word, מִשְׁפָּחָה, for *family*, ſometimes ſignifies *nation*, *land*, or *tribe*; and theſe words of the text under conſideration, as well as of *Micah*, chap. v. 2, are included in Matt. ii. 6, *And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the leaſt among the princes of Judah.*

But how ſhall we reconcile this place of Scripture with the prophecy in Micah v. 2? *And thou* Bethlehem-Ephrata *art little to be among the thouſands of Judah. Out of thee ſhall come forth to me one, who ſhall be a ruler in Iſrael.*

So

So the words of the prophet would ſtand, if literally tranſlated.—Theſe places may be reconciled,

1ſt, If we read the words of the prophet with an interrogation: *And thou Bethlehem-Ephrata, art thou little among the thouſands of Judah? ſince out of thee ſhall come forth to me one, who ſhall be a ruler in Iſrael.* Queſtions of this kind imply the contrary to the thing required; ſo that, *art thou little?* and *thou art not little*, intimate the ſame thing. And as the Hebrew language amidſt its many accents, has no diſtinguiſhing mark for an interrogation, except interrogating adverbs, which do not always take place, it is allowable to ſuppoſe an interrogation any where.

2. If we obſerve that many Hebrew words contain in themſelves contrary ſignifications. The ſame word נָכַר, nakkar, ſignifies *to be known*, and *to be unknown*; עוּף, wuph, *to ſhine*, and *to be obſcure*; נָצַר, natzar, *to ſave*, and *to deſtroy*. In the ſame manner the word

word *tzawir* * may ſignify both *little* and *great*. Dr. Pocock ſaith, that a very learned Jew aſſured him that the word *tzawir* had theſe different ſignifications; and the ſame is aſſerted by Dr. Hammond and other learned men. In ſuch caſe, by comparing the two texts together, it will appear that the words of Micah ſhould be tranſlated thus: *And thou Bethlehem-Judah art great among the thouſands of Judah; out of thee ſhall come a governor of Iſrael. Among the thouſands* in the prophet, is rightly turned *among the princes*; ſince their principalities were over *thouſands*. Thus Numb. i. 16, *Theſe were the renowned of the congregation, princes of the tribes of their families, heads of thouſands in Iſrael.* See alſo 1 Sam. x. 19. By this correction the prophet and evangeliſt will agree, ſince *great* and *not the leaſt* are the ſame. Indeed, it is not likely that Bethlehem ſhould be an obſcure place, eſ-

* In the word צָעִיר, tzawir, I muſt beg pardon for expreſſing the letter hajin by our *w*. But ſince hajin is a ſpirit rough in the ſuperlative degree, our *w* moſt fitly anſwers it. Hence Fοινος, in Æolic Greek, is *vinum* in Latin, *vin* in French, and *wine* in Engliſh. Buxtorf laughs at thoſe who expreſs this letter by *gn*.

pecially

pecially after the days of David, who, as well as his father and grand-father, Ruth iv. 11, 17, was born there. As I have by me the Goſpel of St. Matthew in the original Hebrew, as the editor would inſinuate, publiſhed by Sebaſtian Munſter, I ſhall in Latin letters expreſs the words of the prophet and evangeliſt.

" Micah V. Ve-attah Beth-lechem Ephratah
" tzawir lihjooth be - alphee jehudah.
" Mimmecha lei jeetzee lih-jooth mooſheel
" be-iſrael."

" Matt. II. Ve-attah Beth-lechem Ephratah
" loo tzawir lihjooth be - alphee jehudah.
" Mimmecha lei jeetzee lih-jooth mooſheel
" be-wammei iſrael.

Here we may obſerve, that the common Hebrew Bibles in the prophet have *tzawir*, *little*, and Sebaſtian Munſter's edition of St. Matthew has *loo-tzawir*, *not little*. Is not this a ſort of proof, that *loo*, *not*, has been dropt by tranſcribers in the Hebrew Bible? This obſervation, as I ſuppoſe, never before made, may

may induce that *inſtar omnium eruditorum*, Dr. Kennicott, to ſearch, whether ſome ancient manuſcript has not *loo* in the prophet. The other words of the evangeliſt are agreeable to the prophecy; only that the evangeliſt has *be-wammei iſrael*, *of my people Iſrael*, inſtead of, *be-iſrael*, *of Iſrael*.

3. Zorah and Eſhtaol, whence the Danites came, are two cities, firſt aſſigned, Joſh. xv. 33, to the tribe of Judah; afterwards to the tribe of Dan. In Zorah, or between it and Eſhtaol, was born and buried the mighty Sampſon, Judg. xiii. 2, 25, and xvi. 31.

4. Kirjath-jearim, or, The City of Woods, as it ſignifies by interpretation, was one of the cities of the Gibeonites, Joſh. ix. 17, who obtained by prudence a peace from Joſhua; and is called Baalah, Joſh. xv. 9; Kirjath-baal, Joſh. xv. 60; and was within the tribe of Judah, Joſh. xviii. 14.— But as the firſt diſtribution of cities ſeemed to be found not proportional; this city, as well as Zorah and Eſhtaol, was ſurrendered over to the allotment

lotment of the tribe of Dan, by the name *Baalath*, Joſh. xix. 44. It is alſo called ſimply Baale, 2 Sam. vi. 2; Pharaſim, Iſ. xxviii. 21; and Baal-pharaſim, 2 Sam. v. 20. Here the ark of God remained twenty years in the houſe of Amminadab; and *nigh this* (not *in this place* †, as our tranſlation, Judg. xviii. 12. has it, in contradiction to the words following in the ſame verſe) the Danites encamped in a place called from that fact Mahanah-dan, i. e. the encampment of Dan.

5. Zidon, or Sidon, mentioned Gen. x. 19, as a boundary of the Canaanites; and Gen. xlix. 13, as the border of Zebulun; was probably built by Canaan, the ſon of Ham, the ſon of Noah, and denominated, Gen. x. 15, from Sidon his firſt-born ſon; tho' Juſtin * and other hiſtorians ſay, that it had its name from the abundance of fiſhes in thoſe ſeas, becauſe *Sidon*, in the Phenician language, ſignifies *a Fiſh*. The Canaanites, or Zidoni-

† The prefixt prepoſition *Beth*, ſignifies not only *in*, but *nigh to*.

* *Conditâ ibi urbe, quam a piſcium ubertate Sidona appellaverunt; nam piſcem Phœnices* Sidon *vocant.*

ans,

ans, are often in Scripture-language but another word for Phenicians; and hence Zarephath or Sarepta, 1 Kings xvii. 9, is ſaid to belong to Zidon. The territory of the Zidonians is, by a ſmall correction in the tranſlation, on the northern ſide deſcribed in Joſh. xiii. 5, 6, *The land of the Giblites and all Lebanon toward the ſun-riſing*, (or eaſt, for the weſtern ſide of Mount Libanus belonged to the Amorites) *from Baal-gad under mount Hermon unto the entering into Hamath, all the inhabitants of the hill country from mount Lebanon unto Miſrephothmaim*, even all the Zidonians, not *and all the Zidonians*, ſince there is no word for *and* in the original. That this part belonged to the Zidonians, we may judge from Deut. iii. 9, where we read that *the Zidonians gave to mount Hermon the name of Sireon, but the Amorites the name of Shenir;* and as the Amorites manifeſtly poſſeſſed one ſide of that mountain; ſo the Zidonians may juſtly be preſumed to poſſeſs the other. Hence we may eaſily ſettle the ancient limits of the Zidonians in the days of Joſhua.

The

The town itſelf was ſo great and well-fortified, that the inhabitants deſpiſed any enemy, even to a proverb; ſince the people of Laiſh are ſaid to be careleſs of danger, or confident of their ſecurity, as the original word imports, after the manner of the Zidonians. It was aſſigned to the tribe of Aſher, Joſh. xx. 28, but continued an unconquered town between that tribe and the tribe of Zebulun; ſo that, even to the time of Chriſt, it with Tyre remained under the idolatrous worſhip of Baal and Aſhtaroth its gods, and Aſtarte a goddeſs; which laſt Solomon, by his heatheniſh wives, was ſeduced to worſhip; and Ahab marrying Jezebel, the daughter of Eth-baal the king of the Zidonians, was brought to worſhip Baal, and greatly to provoke the Lord God of Iſrael. It, however, very early received the Chriſtian faith, Luke vi. 17; ſo that St. Paul found chriſtian friends there, Acts xxvii. 3; and hence by it Chriſt, Luke x. 13, reproacheth the unbelieving cities of Judah.

6. Laiſh, or Layiſh, or Laiſa, or Layſa, or Leſen, or Leſhem, ſeems to be originally a

colony from the Zidonians, whose distance from them, however, occasioned a want of confederacy or commerce. In Judges xviii. 7, 28, I have turned, *They had no business with any man*, into, *They had no connection with any man.* The Hebrew phrase precisely answers to this Latin one, *non illis cum quopiam res fuit, they had nothing to do, no intercourse with any man;* for some interpret the Hebrew word by *commerce*, and some by *alliance*, both which senses are included in the word *connexion.*

This city the Danites called *Dan*; but by Greek and Latin historians it was called Paneas. It was one of the ten famous cities of Decapolis, and the metropolis of Iturea and Trachonitis. Here Philip, the son of the elder Herod, and brother of Herod the tetrarch of Galilee, resided, who enlarged it, and called it Cæsarea-Philippi, in honour of Tiberius Cæsar. King Agrippa added other works to it, and called it Neronia, or Nerodias, in honour of the emperor Nero; which name it soon lost, and resumed its old name Paneas, and sometimes in authors, Cesareapaniæ, or -pania, or -paneadis.

Of

Of this city it appears from Euſebius's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, b. vii. ch. 14, and other writers of the church, was the woman whom Chriſt cured of an iſſue of blood by the touch of his garment. Here, for ſome ages, was ſeen her houſe; and before her door, on a baſe or pedeſtal by a fountain, were erected two brazen ſtatues; one in the habit of a woman, in the moſt humble poſture of ſupplication, with bended knees and extended hands; the other in form of a grave man, in a decent doublet, extending with a compaſſionate aſpect his right hand to the woman; which laſt was allowed by all the ancients to bear a very expreſſive likeneſs of Chriſt. —Euſebius the hiſtorian ſays, that he ſaw it with his own eyes in the days of Conſtantine the Great. This image Julian the Apoſtate, in the year of Chriſt 363, threw down, and erected his own in its place; which, as ſay Sozomen and Nicephorus, was daſhed in pieces by lightning.

This city, Dan, was built nigh the conflux where the ſtreams *Jor* and *Dan* unite into the river Jordan, and lieth in the valley

Beth-rehob, otherwiſe called Rehob, a city belonging to the tribe of Aſher, Joſh. xix. 18, and given to the Levites, Joſh. xxi. 31.—But Dan, to which Abraham is ſaid to purſue the invaders, Gen. xiv. 14, is ſaid by Joſephus, b. i. chap. 11, to be one of the ſprings of the river Jordan.—We may add alſo that the expreſſion or proverb, "From Dan to Beerſheba," aroſe from this city, which bounded the Holy Land on one ſide, as Beerſheba did on the other.

CHAP. VII.

A Digreſſion concerning the Conjunction Vau.

IN Judg. xvii. 14, I have turned, *yet he reſtored the money*, into, *ſo he reſtored the money*. *Yet*, in its ſenſe, is ſomewhat adverſative, and implies ſomething ſaid or done in contrariety to another thing which had happened before; and in this place it would convey this ſenſe: *Notwithſtanding what ſhe ſaid to him, yet he returned the money.*— But he had returned the money before ſhe ſpake laſt, and ſo that contrariety has no place. —*So* is recollective and confirmative by repetition of what has been ſaid; *So*, that is, *as it was before obſerved, he returned the money*. The conjunction *vau*, here tranſlated *yet*, ſignifies often *ſo*; and is rightly turned by *ſo*, Judg. xvii. 10, and xviii. 21, and in various other places. How ob-

ſervant, indeed, ought we to be of every minute word in the original! How many texts have a falſe turn given them, for want of attending to the force of ſome little particle! I ſhall exemplify this in the conjunction *vau*, which, beſides its being interrogative and converſive, ſignifies *and*, *but*, *although*, *when*, *then*, *now*, *ſo*, *even*, *or*, *nor*. To give inſtances of each might ſavour of pedantry. I ſhall confine myſelf therefore to the laſt ſenſe, and remark, that when this conjunction follows a negative ſentence, it often conveys a negative virtue to the following ſentence, and ſhould be tranſlated *nor*. Thus in Agur's prayer, *Give me not poverty nor riches*, it is rightly turned by *nor*. By *nor* it is alſo rightly turned in Pſ. i. 5; *Therefore the ungodly ſhall not ſtand in the judgment*, nor *ſinners in the congregation of the righteous*. We ſhould be therefore very obſervant of this force of it. David's character has been certainly vilified by the miſinterpretation of this ſingle letter. This great prince, as we read, forgave Shimei his offence againſt him, and ſware to him by the Lord, that he ſhould not die for it; and yet on his death-bed he is deſcribed,

in

in our tranſlation, as ordering Solomon to put him to death; *not to hold him guiltleſs*, but *to bring down his grey hairs to the grave with blood.* Here the conjunction *vau* is tranſlated by *but*, whereas it ſhould have been turned by *nor.* Let us tranſcribe the order, 1 Kings ii. 8, 9: *And behold, thou haſt with thee Shimei, the ſon of Gera, a Benjamite, who curſed me with a grievous curſe, in the day when I went to Mahanaim. But he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I ſware to him by the Lord, ſaying, I will not put thee to death by the ſword. Now therefore hold him not guiltleſs (for thou art a wiſe man, and knoweſt what thou oughteſt to do)*, nor *his hoar head bring thou to the grave with blood.* The plain meaning of which laſt words is this: "Keep a jealous eye over him as a "Benjamite of the tribe of Saul, a man diſ-"affected to our family, and inclinable to "rebellion; but put him not to death for "his former crime, becauſe I have ſworn "unto him by the Lord, that he ſhould not "die for it." And in this ſenſe Solomon underſtood his father; for he ordered Shimei to confine himſelf at Jeruſalem under his own inſpection, but put him not to death till he

had ſlighted his own poſitive order, which Shimei, under the penalty of death, had ſworn to obey. —The merciful David feared leſt Solomon ſhould of his own reſentment put Shimei to death, and mentioned his oath to deter him from his purpoſe ; for how abſurd is it that David ſhould mention his oath, and break it in his dying moments, by ordering the breach of it, in the ſame breath ? or that Solomon ſhould not execute the orders of his father ?—The conduct of the ſon ſhews that compaſſion, not vengeance, directed the heart of the dying father.

As it gives great light to any paſſage of Scripture, when we can aſcertain on what occaſion it was delivered, a ſuppoſition will be allowed me, that part of the eighth chapter of Eccleſiaſtes was delivered by Solomon to Shimei, when he obliged him under an oath to confine himſelf in the city of Jeruſalem, viz. from the firſt to the ſixth verſe ; and that the reflections from the ſixth to the twelfth verſe, have in view Shimei's tranſgreſſion of that commandment, and his untimely death conſequent thereupon. — We may remark, firſt,

firſt, that the former part of the firſt verſe in Hebrew Bibles is generally adjoined to the laſt verſe of the ſeventh chapter; but that our Engliſh diviſion of the chapters may here be admitted, and that עֹז, wooz, which is tranſlated *boldneſs*, may better take the ſignification of *fortitude*; *The former fortitude of his face ſhall be altered*; that is, he ſhall grow by wiſdom more courageous: or, ſince ſome Hebrew words have two different ſignifications, it may ſignify *fearfulneſs*, or a fortitude which is little: *Wiſdom gives a man preſence of mind, and changes the fearful ſhyneſs of his face.*

This alteration is not only agreeable to natural truth, but exactly to the caſe of Shimei, who doubtleſs was full of confuſion and fear, when brought before Solomon; whom we ſuppoſe to conclude his order of ſtaying at Jeruſalem to him with theſe words: *Who is as the wiſe man? and who knoweth the meaning of an order? A man's wiſdom maketh his face to ſhine, and the fearfulneſs of his face ſhall be changed. I counſel thee to kee the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God. Be not haſty to go out of his ſight*;

ſtand not in an evil thing; for he doeth whatſoever pleaſeth him. Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may ſay unto him, What doeſt thou? Whoſo keepeth the commandment, ſhall feel no evil thing; and a wiſe man's heart diſcerneth both time and judgment. The words are certainly applicable to the occaſion, and the following expreſſions naturally reſult from Shimei's fool-hardy confidence, tranſgreſſion, and death. He found himſelf reſcued from immediate death; that *for every purpoſe there was time and judgment allowed,* and therefore *his malignity of nature* (רנת, Ranath) *was great upon him. For he knew not what ſhould happen; however, he could not by his wickedneſs deliver himſelf from death.* He found at laſt, *that there is a time when a man may inſult over another to his own hurt.* The tenth verſe ſeems more clearly to point at Shimei: *So I ſaw the wicked buried, who had come and gone from the holy place; and they were forgotten in the city, where they had ſo done.* Some benefit at leaſt will ariſe from this my obſervation, ſince all precepts are beſt explained by examples. To return.

In

In Gen. ii. 5, 6, we ſhould read thus; *In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew; the Lord God* †, indeed, *had not cauſed it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground,* nor *did a miſt go up from the face of the earth, and water the whole face of the ground.* In theſe words we find this particle to join the negative ſentence, *there was no man to till the ground,* with the following, *nor went there up a miſt.* The learned Dr. Shuckford juſtly remarks, that it was an ancient opinion, and *very early in Egypt,* where Moſes had his birth and education, that the earth originally of itſelf brought forth its fruits, plants, and trees, yea all kinds of living creatures and men. This productive quality of the earth was, as they imagined, aſſiſted by rains and fertilizing miſts. Moſes on the contrary ſhews, that God *by his word only* cauſed every tree and herb to ſpring from the earth, without the aſſiſtance of rain, culture, or even a miſt.

† כִּי Chi ſometimes ſignifies *nempe, quidem, indeed.*

Hence

Hence the Arabic verſion, *nec exhalatio aſcendebat*, is right.

The Ruſſians, as we read in *The Life of Peter the Great*, had a notion that the world was made in the ſpring, until by a globe introduced it was proved to them, that when it was ſpring in one part of the world, it could not be ſo in another; and that therefore their notion was inſignificant and trifling. Virgil, however, from the Egyptian philoſophy, was whimſical enough to entertain this notion, and plauſibly tells us, how men ſtarted up from the ground.

Non alios primâ creſcentis origine mundi
Illuxiſſe dies, aliumve habuiſſe tenorem
Crediderim; ver illud erat, ver magnus agebat
Orbis, et hybernis parcebant flatibus Euri,
Cum primùm lucem pecudes hausêre, virûmq;
Terrea * *progenies duris caput extulit arvis.*

Georg. II. 341.

* Mr. Warton in the laſt line reads *ferrea*, which Dr. Bentley has fully proved to be *terrea*.

" Such

" Such were the days, the ſeaſon was the ſame,
" When firſt aroſe this world's all-beauteous frame.
" The ſky was cloudleſs, balmy was the air,
" And ſpring's mild influence made young nature fair.
" When cattle firſt o'er new-born mountains ſpread,
" And *Man*, an iron race, up-reared his hardy head.

The ſame poet in his Sixth Eclogue, l. 31, introduces his Silenus ſinging the creation of the world; and without mentioning once a Creator, aſſigns, according to the Epicurean philoſophy, every effect to natural cauſes, and trees, in particular, to rain.

Namque canebat, uti magnum per inane coacta
Semina terrarumq; animæq; mariſq; fuiſſent,
Et liquidi ſimul ignis; ut his exordia primis
Omnia, et ipſe tener mundi concreverit orbis.
Tum durare ſolum et diſcludere Nerea ponto
Cæperit, et rerum paulatim ſumere formas.

Jamq;

Jamq; novum ut terræ ſtupeant luceſcere ſolem,
Altiùs atq; cadant ſubmotis nubibus imbres,
Incipiant ſylvæ cum primùm ſurgere, cumq;
Rara per ignotos errent animalia montes.

" He ſung at univerſal nature's birth
" How ſeeds of water, fire, and air, and earth,
" Fell thro' the void; whence order roſe, and all
" The beauties of this congregated ball.
" How the moiſt ſoil grew ſtiffen'd by degrees,
" And drove to deſtin'd bounds the narrow'd ſeas.
" How earth was ſeiz'd with wonder and affright
" Struck with the new-born ſun's refulgent light;
" How clouds condens'd in liquid ſhow'rs diſtill'd,
" Dropp'd fatneſs and refreſhment on the field;

" *When firſt up ſprings ſublime each
branching grove,
" And ſcatter'd beaſts o'er pathleſs moun-
tains rove."

WARTON.

I ſhall propoſe one text more, viz. Job iv. 18, *Behold he put no truſt in his ſervants, and his angels he charged with folly.* Here we may obſerve that אָמִין, Amin, which we tranſlate, *he put truſt*, is in the future tenſe of the conjugation *Hiphil*, which conjugation generally denotes efficiency on ſome other. Hence the word here, I doubt, not only ſignifies, *he will truſt*, but *he will make to truſt.* And in this we ſhall be more confirmed by conſidering, that an adjective, deduced from this verb, ſignifies not only *faithful*, but *ſtable, firm.* Hence the firſt part of the verſe will

* I muſt beg this elegant tranſlator's pardon for turning *how* into *when*; but by this alteration the ſhowers have their efficacy deſigned by the poet, who expreſſes himſelf by *Incipiant ſylvæ cùm primùm ſurgere, when* the woods firſt began to ſpring up; and who had not uſed *cùm, when*, before, in his deſcription of creation.

ſtand

ſtand thus: *He will* or *hath put no ſtability or ſelf-dependence in his ſervants;* or, word by word, *He will not make his ſervants to confide;* that is, he will not put in his ſervants a confidence independent of himſelf.—The word which in the latter part of the verſe is explained by *folly*, ſignifies alſo *light*, *praiſe*, *boaſting*; for *Toholah* has the ſame root as *Tehillah*, being both derived from הלל, Halal, which properly ſignifies to *praiſe* or *boaſt*. Arias Montanus tranſlates here the word *Toholah*, by *gloriatio*, *boaſting*. Hence the whole verſe will ſtand thus: *He will put no* ſelf-dependence, or *ſtability*, *in his ſervants*, *nor put boaſting in his angels*; and will convey to us this ſenſe: As great and good as the angels are, yet they are not ſure of ſtanding, nor have any occaſion to boaſt before God. How much leſs has a poor mortal creature, who dwells in an houſe of clay, and is cruſted like a moth!

REMARK.

The Latins alſo, in imitation of the Hebrews, give a negative virtue to *et*, *que*, *atque*, *aut*,

aut, *ve*, &c. which ſignify *nor*, when a negative ſentence goes before, *Non jam mater alit tellus*, *vireſque miniſtrat. Virgil. Æn.* II. 71. " Mother earth doth no longer ſupport it, " *nor* ſupply ſtrength." See *Virg. Georg.* IV. 211, 212. *Æn.* II. 21. *Horace*, *Od. L.* II. *Od.* 9. *Yea*, a following negative, ſometimes throws back a negative virtue on the foregoing part. See *Hor. Carm. L.* III. *Od.* 15, line 12, 13, 14, &c.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Other corrections in these Chapters accounted for.

THE other alterations which we have made in those chapters, will best appear at one view, in which we shall only note, that,

In the second verse of the seventeenth chapter, I have turned *the eleven hundred shekels of silver, which were taken from thee, about which thou cursedst, and spakest of also in mine ears*; into, *the eleven hundred shekels of silver, which were taken by thee, and about which thou laidst me under the obligation of an oath, and also strictly chargedst me.* To justify which alteration we may observe, that the Hebrew verb לקח, Lachak, signifies not only *to take away*, but simply *to take.* Thus this verb is used in Gen. xxvii. 46, *If Jacob take a wife.* Here it plainly signifies, *to take to himself.* In the same manner

manner Micah's mother had *took this money to herſelf;* that is, ſhe had taken out this from her whole ſubſtance, and had conſecrated it to GOD's worſhip. Hence Arias Montanus tranſlates the words by *quod captum eſt tibi, which was taken by thee*; and the Greek verſion, ὃς ἐλαβες σεαυτῇ, *which thou tookeſt to thyſelf*, more fully favours us. Hence this correction has reaſon and authority on its ſide.

Again, in the Hebrew there are no words to ſignify *about which*, though they are implied; but there is the word for *me*, after the verb, which the Engliſh tranſlation rendered here by *curſedſt*. The Greek verſion anſwers here again exactly to the original, Καὶ με ἠρασω, *and thou devotedſt me*. The Hebrew word אלה, *Alah*, ſignifies both *to ſwear*, and *to make* another *to ſwear;* which laſt ſignification it generally takes, when it has a word after it. Thus, 1 Kings viii. 31, this word is rightly rendered by, *cauſe to ſwear: If any man treſpaſs againſt his neighbour, and an oath be laid upon him, to cauſe him to ſwear.* The ſame word hath the ſignification of laying under the obligation of a curſe, in 1 Sam. xiv. 24.

The men of Iſrael were diſtreſſed that day, for Samuel had adjured the people, i. e. had laid them under a curſe.—The word then has the ſignification of *making to ſwear*; and ſince a mother's curſing *her ſon* ſeems ſo harſh that the Engliſh tranſlators leave out *me*, which is in the original after *curſedſt*; yea, ſince curſing at all is unbecoming of a woman who was religious, that ſignification, *thou madeſt me to ſwear*, or *thou laidſt me under the obligation of a ſolemn oath*, is moſt natural, and therefore preferable. If we conſider alſo the cuſtom of binding relations by oath to fulfil the intentions of the party, we ſhall be more induced to admit this alteration. Thus Abraham made his ſervant ſwear about taking a wife for his ſon, Gen. xxiv. 3; Jacob makes Joſeph ſwear concerning his burial, Gen. xlvii. 31; Joſeph makes the children of Iſrael to ſwear concerning the removing of his bones, Gen. l. 25; Joſhua lays the people under the obligation of an oath never to rebuild Jericho, Joſh. vi. 26. It was cuſtomary among the Jews to ſwear their friends to the performance of their will; and therefore Micah's mother did no more than what was uſual,

uſual, when ſhe obliged her ſon by oath *to lay out that money*, which ſhe had allotted for that purpoſe, *on the worſhip of God.*

As for the other alteration, *Thou chargedſt me ſtrictly alſo*, inſtead of *Thou ſpakedſt alſo in mine ears*; we may obſerve, that *to ſpeak in one's ears* is an Hebrew idiom for *to charge ſtrictly.* Thus Deut. v. 1, *Hear, O Iſrael! the ſtatutes and judgments* which I ſpake in your ears *this day*, i. e. obey the ſtatutes and judgments which I ſtrictly charge you this day. To *ſpeak* and *to command*, are ſynonymous words often with the Hebrews. *Theſe are the teſtimonies, and the ſtatutes, and the judgments, which Moſes* ſpake *unto the children of Iſrael*, Deut. iv. 45, is the ſame *with the commandments which Moſes commanded*, Deut. viii. 1.—There is another Hebrew idiom in the third verſe of this ſeventeenth chapter, where *from my hand*, is put for *entirely*, or *ſo as to have no farther right in it.*

I have alſo turned *carved image* and *molten image*, into *carved* or *graven thing*, and molten *thing*; becauſe the word *thing* will take

in the ſenſe of *image*, or whatever elſe it might be. But as I ſhall treat largely of this matter hereafter, I muſt beg the reader to permit me to conſult brevity, and to avoid repetition.

In verſe the fifth, I have turned *Houſe of Gods* into *Houſe of God*, ſo the Greek verſion has it; ὁ οἶκος Μιχαιᾳ αὐτῳ οἶκος Θεȣ : *The houſe of Micah was to him the houſe of God.* He had laid out the money in the ſervice of that Jehovah, to whom it had been conſecrated; and had an houſe of prayer for himſelf and his neighbours.—The purſuit of thoſe neighbours with Micah after the Danites, who had taken away *the divine furniture*, not only ſhews Micah's great intereſt amongſt them, but that they thought themſelves *intereſted in it*.—The word *teraphim* I might have turned by *forms of cherubim*, on the authority of St. Jerom, who ſays, that ſome teraphim were made in imitation of the *cherubim* by the ark in the tabernacle or temple.

In the eighteenth chapter and fifteenth verſe, I have turned *ſaluted him* into *ſaluted it.* The Danites came to the houſe of Micah, and ſaluted

ſaluted *it*, viz. the whole houſe or family. In the original it is, *They wiſhed peace to it.* Micah, at the arrival of the Danites, does not ſeem to be at home, but to arrive there in a little time after their departure; otherwiſe it is not well to be accounted for, by what means the five Danites, without any oppoſition, took away the furniture of his houſe of prayer.—But there is another reaſon to be aſſigned for the alteration. The words *Peace be to this houſe*, appear to be the common ſalutation of all travelling Jews at the entering of a ſtranger's houſe. This we may ſupport by 1 Sam. xxv. 5, 6, where we read that *David ſent out ten young men; and David ſaid unto the young men, Get you up to Carmel, and go to Nabal, and greet him in my name, and thus ſhall ye ſay to him, For life peace be to thee, and peace to thine houſe, and peace to all that thou haſt.* This ſalutation, therefore, was like to the carrying of the olive-branch in their hands, to ſhew that they came peaceably, and without any hoſtile deſign. Hence Matt. viii. 12, 13, Our Saviour orders his diſciples, when they came into an houſe, *to ſalute it;* that is, *to let their peace come upon it*, or to ſay, Luke x. 5, *Peace be to this houſe.*

In the eighteenth chapter, verſe the twenty-firſt, I have turned *the little ones, and cattle, and the carriage before them*, into words which will bear the ſame ſenſe, viz. into *the youth, and what they had gotten, and the precious things before them;* not being certain but that the words might include the young Levite, and their booty: though I verily believe that the words are rightly tranſlated; becauſe it was uſual for the unſettled Iſraelites to carry their wives, children, and ſubſtance with them, and in time of battle, to leave them in the camp under a ſufficient guard. Indeed the children of Gad, and the children of Reuben, and the half-tribe of Manaſſes, built cities, Numb. xxxii. *for their wives, their little ones, and their flocks*, becauſe their ſettlement was fixt, but the perſons unſettled carried them with them; and therefore 'tis likely that theſe Danites had theirs alſo with them.

In the eighteenth chapter, verſe the twenty-fourth, I have turned *Elohim*, by *divine worſhip*, or *furniture*, and not by *Gods*. It is plain that the Danites had taken away all the furniture of Micah's houſe of prayer, viz.

his Ephod, and his forms of cherubim, as well as his graven thing and his molten thing, and that he muſt mean his whole furniture by *Elohim*. This appears from the words of Micah himſelf: *Ye have taken away my holy furniture, even every part thereof, for what have I left?* The expreſſion, *What have I left?* opens the meaning of the foregoing words. — The word *Elohim*, indeed, ſometimes ſignifies *angels*, and ſo might refer to the *teraphim*, thoſe repreſentations of angels. But there is no neceſſity for ſuch reſtriction, ſince *Elohim* ſometimes ſignifies *divine worſhip*, or the *altar*, the principal place of divine worſhip, in the ſame manner as the owner is ſometimes put for the houſe. Thus, in Pſalm xliii. 4, *Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy.* Here, *unto God* is plainly put for *unto divine worſhip*, or *unto the altar*, the principal place of divine worſhip. We ſhall find the ſame in that difficult paſſage of the eighty-fourth Pſalm, a paſſage not yet well explained by any man: *How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hoſts! My ſoul longeth, yea even fainteth, for the courts*

of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God. Yea, the sparrow hath found an house, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young; even thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my king and my God." This is our translation.—But surely we cannot imagine, that the swallows built, or the sparrows lodged, upon the altars.—Let us attempt a solution by observing,

1st, That Eastern writers delight to take their images from simple nature; and as David had been shewn by divine instruction, either by inspiration or by vision, (see 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 12, &c. to 19) the whole structure of the temple which should be built by his son Solomon, he expresses, in rapturous fervor of soul, his own desires of entering into such a glorious place of worship, and his warm wish of fixing on the place and building of the edifice; and in the most exalted manner of sublime simplicity he images out that anxious wish by the sollicitude which birds plainly express, till by flying here and there they have found some place of seemingly

ingly ſafe retreat by night for themſelves, and of a neſt for their young.

2. He fixt on ſwallows and ſparrows, not only as frequenting houſes, but in thoſe countries making their lodgments on the outſide of temples. This we may collect from that ſtory of Herodotus, where he tells us, that Ariſtodicus, going on purpoſe about the temple of Apollo amongſt the Branchidæ, afterwards called Didyme, in Mileſia, a country on the confines of Ionia, took down the neſts of ſparrows and other birds that lodged there.

3. Buxtorf, in his Hebrew Lexicon, tells us, that when the particle כַּם, *gam*, is repeated in the ſame ſentence, it ſignifies *as* in the firſt particle, and *ſo* in the other. "*Repetitum in continuatione ſententiæ eſt*, tam, quam: *Being repeated in the continuance of a ſentence it means, ſo, as;* and we may obſerve, in the original, that this particle *is repeated.* Alſo by ſuppoſing *the paragogicum* put to the infinitive mood, which all Hebrew grammars prove uſual; the word *hath found* will be turned

turned into *to find.* By which obſervation, without altering one letter, and only by putting the compariſon into a parentheſis, an eaſy ſenſe will ariſe thus: "*How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hoſts! My fleſh longeth and ſo pineth* with deſire for the courts of the Lord, and my fleſh *ſo* crieth out for the living God (as the ſparrow to find an houſe and the ſwallow a neſt, where ſhe may lay her young) even for thy altars, O Lord of hoſts, my king and my God.

REMARK.

Gam ſignifies *ſo* in this connectively-relative ſenſe, though it ſtands ſingle, and the firſt *gam* or *chi* is ſuppreſſed. Thus in Hoſ. iii. 3, *Thou ſhalt abide for me many days; thou ſhalt not play the harlot, and thou ſhalt not be for another man;* ſo *will I alſo be for thee.* Here the ſenſe runs thus: *And as thou ſhalt be for me only, and not for another man; ſo will I alſo be for thee.* Here the word ſignifying *as* is ſuppreſſed in the original, and hence not taken notice of in our tranſlation.—Sometimes the word

word *gam* for *ſo* is ſuppreſſed. Thus in Hoſ. iv. 6. *For thy people are, as they that ſtrive with the prieſt;* that is, thy people are *ſo*, as they that ſtrive with the prieſt. In theſe places, *gam* ſignifying in one verſe *ſo*, and in the other *as*, continues the compariſon; and as this uſe of a ſingle *gam* is ſcarce obſerved in any Hebrew lexicon, this ſhort remark may not be uſeleſs.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Micah's Character.

BY almoſt all writers has Micah and his good mother been roughly handled. The ſon in particular has been treated as an innovator in religion by conſecrating one of his ſons, and an idolater in ſetting up graven images, in which the mother is intermixed. But if we conſider that Micah was certainly one of thoſe friends to all mankind, who kept a houſe of public hoſpitality for all ſtrangers; that ſingular virtue lays an obligation on all men to ſee what may be ſaid in his favour. In Judges ii. 7, we read, that *the people ſerved the Lord all the days of Joſhua, and all the days of the elders that out-lived Joſhua, who had ſeen all the great works of the Lord, that he did for Iſrael.* Now we have before proved that Micah lived in this time. And

it

it appears from the name *Jehovah* made uſe of both by him and his mother, that they ſerved the true God. They both alſo had manifeſtly a religious turn of mind; for as mount Ephraim, or that part of it where Micah lived, was ſomewhat diſtant from Shiloh, where the tabernacle of the Lord at this time was, this family was thereby deprived of the happineſs of ſerving God before his altar. To remedy this unhappineſs of ſituation as much as poſſible, this religious woman had taken out money to eſtabliſh an houſe of prayer for her family and neighbours, and had dedicated it from her hand entirely to the Lord.—She had dedicated it to the Lord (in the original, to Jehovah) the ſame Supreme Being to whom ſhe before had recommended her ſon for a bleſſing: *Bleſſed be thou to Jehovah, my ſon.* This ſhews that ſhe was a worſhipper of the true God, becauſe the name *Jehovah* in ſcripture is never given to any other God, either falſe or figurative. And whereas ſhe dedicated eleven hundred ſhekels to God, and *her graven thing* and *molten thing*, whatever they were, coſt

coſt but *two hundred*, ver. 4. it is not to be doubted, but ſhe laid out the remaining nine hundred in the houſe, and preparing a proper ſalary for a prieſt, if any ſhould paſs by that way.

It has been one objection to the good Micah, that he could have no right to conſecrate his ſon or the Levite. He might have no right to conſecrate his ſon, though great allowance muſt be had for caſes of neceſſity, eſpecially where the intention is pious. Thus in 2 Chron. xxix. 34, and xxx. 17, in a caſe of neceſſity the Levites were admitted to perform a part of the prieſt's office.

As for the Levite, in the caſe of Micah, he was doubtleſs a *praying prieſt* before his arrival at the houſe of Micah; and therefore the words *he conſecrated*, can have no other ſignification than *he made him his prieſt*, by delivering the ephod, we may ſuppoſe, into his hands. What we tranſlate *he conſecrated*, in Hebrew, is *he filled the hand*; which idiom began from the cuſtom preſcribed by God at the conſecration of Aaron and

and his ſons, Levit. viii. 25 ; where we find that the fat, the rump, the fat that covered the inteſtines, the caul above the liver, the two kidneys, and the fat upon them, the right ſhoulder, one loaf of unleavened bread, one cake and one wafer of the meat-offering, were put into the hands of Aaron and his ſons ; and Moſes keeping his hand under theirs, that they were waved by them all up and down, all manner of ways, towards the eaſt, weſt, north, and ſouth, to ſignify that He to whom the offering was made, was Lord of the whole world. Moſes therefore *filled their hands* ; and hence the phraſe *to fill the hand* ſignifies the ſame as *to conſecrate.* But there was no ſacrifice in the caſe of Micah ; for though it will appear hereafter, that they had altars at this time in their houſes of prayer, yet they were not deſigned for ſacrifice : conſequently the words here can have no other ſignification, than that he made him his prieſt by delivering ſomething (moſt probably the ephod, which was the diſtinguiſhing garment of the prieſthood) into his hands.—Indeed we are much in the dark as to the cuſtoms of thoſe days ; and therefore we

we have a ſtrong reaſon to imagine, that all Levites *were inducted* into their houſes of prayer by ſome peculiar ceremony of the kind above obſerved, and that here is preſerved a curious piece of Hebrew antiquity. Charity at leaſt would incline us to think ſo, beſides the reaſonableneſs of the thing itſelf, rather than to treat the character of the univerſally-charitable Micah and his mother in that ſcurvy manner in which almoſt all writers have done. I am ſure that the reflection that Micah makes on having a regular prieſt, is very remote from deſerving that deriſion and contempt to which it has been ſubjected: *Now know I that the Lord will do me good, ſeeing I have a Levite to my prieſt.* The word *Lord* in the original is *Jehovah*, which ſhews that Micah, as well as his mother, was a worſhipper of the true God. It appears alſo that his conſecrating his ſon to be their praying prieſt, was occaſioned by mere neceſſity.—To correct this imperfection in Micah's worſhip, God ſeems to have directed the Levite there;—at leaſt Micah conſiders it in that light,—whoſe words paraphraſed will ſtand thus: *I have now a regular worſhip*

of the God of Heaven in my houſe, and I am certain that the Supreme God, who has ſent me a regular prieſt, will proſper me. This warm expreſſion of confidence in God pleads ſtrongly for him, and argues, that he was not only a worſhipper of the true GOD, but an adherent to the worſhip inſtituted by Moſes.

It has been alſo obſerved, that thoſe words, *In thoſe days there was no king in Iſrael, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes*, are inſerted to ſhew ſome irregular practices. The obſervation is reaſonable; and I think that in chap. xvii. ver. 6. it intimates that Micah had no right to conſecrate his ſon; and he himſelf ſeems ſenſible of his error, ſince, on the arrival of a regular prieſt, he ſets aſide his ſon, and then expects God's bleſſing upon his houſe.—And it may reflect upon his *mixt* worſhip—*if he was guilty of it*; though we ſhall ſtrive in that to make our beſt apology for him.—But the words in the eighteenth chapter plainly refer to the Danites, who unlawfully robbed him of the furniture of his houſe of prayer.

CHAP. X.

The Conduct of the Danites faulty, but of the Levite, in a manner, faultleſs.

THOUGH partial favour may plead for the conduct of the Danites,

1. That Micah's houſe, though too remote to attend weekly on the ſervice of the tabernacle, yet was much nearer to it than Laiſh or Dan.

2. That the Danites did not deſign to convert the furniture of Micah's *proſeucha* to a private uſe; but to continue it in the ſervice of that God to whom it had been dedicated.

3. As they continued it in God's ſervice, and ſo avoided the ſin of ſacrilege, ſo they could ſcarce be guilty of thievery. The goods were not Micah's, but God's. Ἁγιαζόσα

ζησα ἡγιασα το ἀργυριον τῳ Κυριῳ ἐκ της χειρος μου· "I have wholly consecrated the silver to the "LORD from my hand," says Micah's mother.

4. A greater good ought, doubtless, to take place of a lesser.

These things may be said to alleviate, but not to justify their action; since,

1. By this action they deprived the good Micah of the public worship of God, which at a great expence his mother had settled.

2. Though these holy utensils were consecrated to God, *yet the use of them in religious acts* is still reserved to the consecrator, or church, on which they have by him been bestowed, and were deposited. Hence the man or church is *robbed of the use*, even though the vessels in another church are reserved for the service of God.

3. The Danites could not plead absolute necessity, though they might allege a present occasion. They might have provided those things from the spoils of enemies.

4. They, beſides the robbery before-mentioned, moſt ungratefully violated the rules of hoſpitality; and acted (Gen. xlix. 17.) like the ſerpents by the way, or the adders in the path, which do miſchief to the unſuſpecting traveller.

But the Levite was not faulty in going with the Danites, for theſe reaſons:

1. He had agreed only for a yearly ſalary. This he received only while he ſtaid. When he went away it ceaſed, and another travelling Levite might be glad of it. Micah could not command his ſtay, and therefore his departure was no injuſtice.

2. By departing and following the Danites he was advanced; and advancement, when juſtly attained, is lawful.

3. He may charitably be preſumed to purſue a greater good in religion, in preſerving the worſhip of God amongſt a large town in Iſrael, rather than in a private houſe.

This

This part, however, of the Levite's conduct has been overlooked; but the requeſt of the Danites to him to conſult God, and the anſwer of this prieſt, has been treated in a very ridiculous way; and the Levite has been taxed with the groſs impiety of anſwering theſe Danites ſuitably to their own wiſhes, out of his own conceit, and yet pretending to an authority from God. Theſe cenſurers can have no authority, from God or man, to lay ſuch an uncharitable accuſation; eſpecially when the anſwer which he gave them was true, and probably directed by the God of truth.—Theſe men ſurely do not conſider the importance of the queſtion, nor the danger which the Levite muſt expoſe himſelf to, if his words ſhould be found falſe.—The ſpies were but five men, who, as well as the Levite, were doubtleſs ignorant of the temper and way of life of the inhabitants of the place, which they were going to ſearch; and ſhould they be diſcovered and intercepted, they muſt periſh; at leaſt fly for their lives.—And ſhould that have happened, which none but God could foreſee that it would not, then let us ſee (in Deut. xviii. 20, 21, 22) what

the Levite was to expect from men enraged at their disappointment and their past perils, and authorized by God to take vengeance. *The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath spoken? when the prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass; that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously. Thou shalt not be afraid of him.* Every modern annotator, which I have seen on these chapters, exclaims every now and then at the ignorance of the Levite, or of Micah, or of the Danites; as if they knew no more of the law of Moses, than a poor Mahometan. *By chance* the ignorance lies in our own minds, who have not duly considered the customs of those days.—*By chance* here may be traced some exquisite pieces of Jewish antiquities. The affair, however, is worthy of an enquiry.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

The high-prieſt only was allowed to wear the Ephod (in which were placed the Urim and Thummim) and to conſult God by Urim; but other inferior prieſts might requeſt an anſwer from God in another way.

THE moſt reaſonable account that I can collect of the Urim and Thummim, ſeems to be this: That the *Urim* was an image repreſentative of the *Seraphim*, an order of angels, and aſſigned to the high-prieſt in token of his prophetic office only, when he went to enquire of God in ſome embarraſſed affairs of the ſtate, for a perſon, or about a thing of the greateſt importance; and the *Thummim* was an image made in likeneſs of that image, which the Egyptian high-prieſts,

who were alſo chief judges, wore, as the enſign of the judicial office. Theſe two images were the enſigns to the high-prieſt of his two great offices, viz. that of conſulting God, as high-prieſt, and that of chief judge. Theſe were kept from common defilement, as well as from common eyes, by being put into the breaſt-plate, which was made ſquare, and being doubled was ſown firm on three ſides; and the fourth ſide not being ſown together, was made in form of a little ſquare bag, or purſe; and ſo it incloſed the images, the *Urim* and *Thummim*; which were probably never taken out but in the time of the diſcharge of the particular office hieroglyphically ſpecified by each; and which in their names conveyed the virtues alſo, which a prieſt and a judge ſhould be endowed with, viz. Light, or ſound Knowledge, and Truth and Uprightneſs of Mind. They were likewiſe very expreſſive of the clearneſs and perfectneſs of the anſwers given by God to the high-prieſt who wore the breaſt-plate. In matters therefore which concerned the whole ſtate, or a principal member, ſuch as Joſhua was; for whom therefore the prieſt Eleazar,

Numb.

(Numb. xxvii. 21) is ordered *to aſk counſel after the judgment of Urim before the Lord*;—on affairs, or for men, of ſuch importance, when the will of God was neceſſary to be known, the high-prieſt put on his robes, and over them the breaſt-plate, in which the Urim and Thummim were.—The prieſt thus arrayed, and taking out the Urim in his hand, preſented himſelf before the ark of the covenant; and in extraordinary and unavoidable caſes, as in that of David, mentioned in 1 Sam. xxiii. probably before ſome little altar erected for that preſent occaſion. There he aſked counſel of God, with his face turned directly towards the ark, and the mercy-ſeat over it; upon which the Divine Preſence reſted. There he humbly propoſed what he wanted to be reſolved about; and had, as it is plain from ſcripture, an anſwer in an audible voice. *The LORD ſaid*, introduces almoſt every anſwer given in this way of conſultation; and men thus conſulting, are ſaid (Iſai. xxx. 2. Joſh. ix. 14) to aſk counſel *at the mouth of God*. Hence the place where the ark and mercy-ſeat ſtood, from whence the anſwer was given, is in ſcripture ſtiled the *Oracle*.—And I may add,

add, that ſince the *Divine Preſence*, which appeared and returned anſwers, was manifeſtly the ſecond perſon in the ever-bleſſed Trinity, (ſee 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 9) hence one reaſon appears, why the Son is often ſtiled *the Word*. The anſwer given by God, when enquired of, by *Urim*, by his lights, was plainly vocal.

This majeſtic method of conſulting God, was doubtleſs confined to the high-prieſt, whoſe office, in this reſpect, was the moſt auguſt in all human nature.—But was it not lawful for any other man, beſides the high-prieſt, to conſult God; or in any other place beſides the tabernacle? In my opinion, we may ſafely aſſert the lawfulneſs.—Joſhua, indeed, in Numb. xxvii. 21, ſeems ordered to apply to Eleazar for counſel; but that by the context was plainly deſigned, that his orders might have the greater weight with the children of Iſrael.—But where is there any command, that no man ſhould be applied to but the chief-prieſt, and in no place but before the tabernacle? Why ſhould God give that order of puniſhing falſe prophets with death, and give the ſigns of a falſe prophet, who

ſhould preſume to ſpeak from his own heart, and yet uſe the name of the Lord, if no man was permitted to propheſy but the chief-prieſt? Was not the will of the Lord revealed unto Samuel (1 Sam. iii. 19, 20) when as yet he was not chief-prieſt? Did not Samuel pray unto God at Mizpah, and was heard, 1 Sam. vii. 9? Did he not conſult God at Ramah about chooſing a king, 1 Sam. viii. 7, 21? Did not Saul go there to conſult God by means of Samuel, 1 Sam. ix. 9, compared with 1 Sam. vii. 17? Did not David conſult God at Keilah, 1 Sam. xxiii. 8? Did not Saul ſeek to conſult God not only by Urim, but alſo by dreams and by prophets, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6? Is it not very plain, therefore, that other men were conſulted beſides the high-prieſt; and that God ſometimes did reveal himſelf to them, though not with an audible voice, as when he was enquired of by Urim?—The Levite doubtleſs was not permitted to conſult God by Urim. But does not the requeſt of the Danites to him to conſult God, ſhew, that it was permitted to the Levites, on ſome extraordinary occaſions, to preſent themſelves before the altar in the houſe

houſe of prayer, arrayed with their ephod, and with a little teraphim in their hand, made in imitation of the Urim, and humbly petition an anſwer from God?. It is not ſaid that he obtained his anſwer here by a voice. It is almoſt certain, that he had his information by a revelation conveyed directly into his mind, by the ſpirit of GOD, by an immediate inſpiration. This was often conferred on other men beſides the high-prieſt. Thus this immediate irradiation of the ſpirit of God fell, we read, upon Saul. Had the Levite received an anſwer by a voice, he would have expreſſed himſelf, as in caſes of that kind, by *God ſaid*, or *Hear the word of the Lord*, or the like. His prediction or anſwer ſeems therefore directed by the divine illapſe into his mind. His anſwer was certainly true, and, in all probability, guided by the God of Truth. In ſuch caſe, again, the worſhip there paid to God does not appear diſagreeable to him.

RE-

REMARK.

BY chance it may be expected, that I ſhould at leaſt give a ſhort reaſon, why I have rejected the fanciful accounts which have been given of the Urim and Thummim by ſome writers of no ſmall name. I would have given it, but found that it would draw me into a large diſſertation. Let me note only, that Spencer, Selden, and other writers, have fully proved, that God condeſcended to accommodate his worſhip, as much as poſſible, to the notions of the Jews, who were apt to be ſeduced by every thing gaudy; and, to ſuit his ſervice to their weakneſs, ſelected, for the dreſs of his high-prieſt, every grand ornament that was wore by the heathen prieſts throughout the world. Agreeable to this conduct towards his people, he ſelected the Thummim, and, in my opinion, the Urim alſo, from the Egyptians. The Egyptian high-prieſts were, as well as the Iſraelitiſh, among the chief-judges; and if we obſerve that the Septuagint turn Thummim by ἀληθοτης, *truth*, we ſhall find that the Egyptian

tian judges wore it, from Ælian's Various Hiſtory, B. 14. Chap. 30. Δικασαι δε το αρχαιον παρ' Αιγυπτιοις ιερεις ησαν. Ην δε τουτων αρχων ο πρεσβυτατος, και εδικαζεν απαντας. Εδει δε αυτον ειναι δικαιοτατον ανθρωπων, και αφειδεστατον. Ειχε δε και αγαλμα περι τον αυχενα εκ σαπφειρου λιθε και εκαλειτο το αγαλμα Αληθεια. "In ancient times, among the Egyptians, the prieſts were their judges; and the oldeſt man was the preſident of them all, and judged all men. But it was expected in him, that he ſhould be the moſt juſt and temperate of all men. He had alſo an image of a ſapphire-ſtone round his neck, and that image was named TRUTH." Diodorus Siculus alſo, in his firſt book of the Egyptian affairs, deſcribes Αρχιδικασην εχουτα την Αληθειαν εξηρτημενην εκ του τραχηλου, "the chief judge having TRUTH hung on his neck;" and again he ſays, Συνταξεις των αναγκαιων παρα του βασιλεως τοις μεν δικασαις ικαναι προς διατροφην εχορηγουντο· τω δε αρχιδικασῃ παραπλησιοι. Εφορει δε ουτος επι του τραχηλου εκ χρυσης αλυσεως ηρτημενον ζωδιον των πολυτελων λιθων, ο προσηγορευον Αληθειαν· τουτου αμφισβητησεων ηρχοντο, επειδαν την της Αληθειας εικονα ο Αρχιδικασης προσθειτο. "Very handſome ſalaries were allowed by the king for the maintenance of the judges;

judges ; but, for the chief judge, ſalaries adequate to his dignity. But he wore on his neck, ſuſpended by a golden chain, a little form of precious ſtones, which they called TRUTH. And they began their pleadings in their courts of judicature, when the chief judge had put on this image of TRUTH."

CHAP. XII.

The nature of Divine Viſion largely explained.

WE may collect * from ſcripture, that God manifeſted his will to the high-prieſt by a voice; to his prophets by dreams and viſions; and to other men, by what the Jews themſelves called the Holy Spirit. It was the received opinion of all the Jewiſh doctors, that all the revelations made by God to the prophets, however they are expreſſed or deſcribed, are to be underſtood as made to them in a *dream* or *viſion:* only that God vouchſafed Moſes a more peculiar favour by converſing with him face to face, for forty days, in mount Sinai. And, indeed, the words of God (Numb. xii. 6) ſeem to favour this opinion: *Hear now my words, if there be a*

* The ingenious Treatiſe of the learned Mr. Peters on Job, has greatly aſſiſted me in this diſſertation.

prophet

prophet among you; I the LORD will make myſelf known to him in a viſion, and will ſpeak unto him in a dream. My ſervant Moſes is not ſo, who is faithful in all my houſe. With him will I ſpeak mouth to mouth.

If it is here ſaid, that indeed we can apprehend what a diſcovery *by a dream* may be, but cannot conceive the nature of viſion; it muſt be allowed to be difficult to apprehend in what preciſe manner the prophets received the certainty of any inſpiration that way from God, becauſe viſion is now entirely ceaſed. —A man who never had ſpiritual ſight, can have no exact notion of perceiving ſpiritual objects; no more than a man, who never enjoyed natural ſight, can entertain of natural objects. God, however, who is an eternal Spirit, and the father and life of our ſpirits, can eaſily communicate to the ſoul of man the knowledge of his will in an extraordinary way; and that with ſo much certainty and light, that the man may be aſſured, that God is the author of thoſe things, which are at that time communicated to him. God

muſt thus enlighten the minds of the prophets, who alone fore-knew the future events of things.

There may be alſo powers in our minds, which are now clogged, and, as it were, ſwallowed up in the heavy dregs of this earthly body, which ſleep for a time; but, when "we have ſhuffled off this mortal coil," will be awakened, or rather relieved, from the oppreſſive weight, and exerciſe themſelves with freedom and pleaſure. By theſe means, we ſhall at once ſee, and be able to converſe with, ſpiritual beings, and enjoy the true viſion of God. Men, who have made the deepeſt reſearches into the nature of our future happineſs, have concluded this to be truth with the greateſt degree of probability. —Perhaps the power of viſion in the prophets may be ſomething of this kind: a new power of the mind, or a new ſenſe awakened in them. The film which their earthy body ſpread over *the eye of the ſoul*, τὸ ὀμμα της ψυχης, as Philo Judæus calls it, may be removed; and by that means they may enjoy the ſight of God, and hear his orders with as much certainty,

tainty, as they hear or see men with their bodily senses. This manifestation of the Deity, made to them by this kind of vision, 'tis almost certain, conferred on the prophets the names of *seers*. Thus Gad was David's *seer*, נביא חוזה, nabia choseh, *seeing prophet*, in the original.

If we view the account which the Scriptures give us, we shall find a very great agreement and uniformity in their description of the manner of these visions. In condescension to our present apprehensions, God is there described as holding a consultation among his heavenly nobles, that host of angels, who wait around his throne. Into this grand assembly the prophet is admitted, and there permitted to see and hear what God decrees shall come to pass, and from thence is commissioned to declare these things to men. Hence Jeremiah proposes this very remarkable question to the false prophets in his days: Jer. xxiii. 18, *Who*, or which of you, *hath stood in the council of the Lord, and hath perceived and heard his word?* i. e. Which of you hath been admitted into that assembly, which

compoſes the council of Jehovah? Which of you hath been wrapt in true viſion, and, as a ſtander-by, hath heard thoſe conſultations which are held in the preſence of God, and been commiſſioned to publiſh his great decrees to mankind? Theſe falſe prophets, therefore, deceived the people with promiſes of happineſs from God, and made them vain; pretending a viſion of God, which they received not from the mouth of the Lord, but invented out of their own heart. For thus in ver. 21, the true prophet proceeds: *I have not ſent theſe prophets, yet they ran; I have not ſpoken to them, yet they propheſied: but if they had ſtood in my council*, amidſt that aſſembly of heaven before mentioned, *and had cauſed my people to hear my words, then ſhould they have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.* And ver. 32, *Behold, I am againſt them that propheſy falſe dreams, ſaith the Lord, and do tell them, and cauſe my people to err by their lies, and by their lightneſs; yet I ſent them not, nor commanded them, ſaith the Lord.* It is plain that the Scripture ſpeaks here of God after the manner of men; and it is probable, that in our preſent ſtate of

being, we cannot apprehend otherwiſe theſe divine repreſentations. Our underſtandings are limited, and things muſt be brought down within theſe bounds, or otherwiſe we can have no conceptions of them. As kings therefore tranſact their moſt important affairs by convening a council of ſtate; ſo God is pleaſed to repreſent himſelf as ſurrounded by his council alſo, and paſſing the high decrees of his will and providence in the aſſembly of his holy angels. Then the prophet, to whom God is pleaſed to reveal ſuch his will, is admitted *in a viſion* to this ſolemn conſultation, as a ſtander-by, and hearer of what is there decreed and reſolved. He ſtands in the council or aſſembly of Jehovah as a waiter, or ſervant, ready to carry his meſſage to his people. He ſees, and hears his word; ſees what is there tranſacted; and hears the decree that is paſt, and the meſſage which he is to carry. And hence came the reproof of Jeremiah to the falſe prophets, who had never ſtood in the council of the Lord, and yet preſumed to carry meſſages as if ſent by God.

Here then we may ſee the privilege allowed to many of the ancient prophets. They declared their words from the order of the Moſt High, being admitted into his preſence, and hearing his commands. Hence Iſaiah chap. ii. ver. 1) is ſaid *to ſee the word;* that is, to hear it immediately ſpoken from God's mouth. So Rev. i. 12, *I turned to ſee the voice that ſpake with me.* Indeed theſe prophets ſeemed freed from the weight of mortality for a while. They were carried *without* or *outſide* their bodies, being overpowered by the ſpirit of God.

- - - - *Corpus mortale tumultus*
Non tulit æthereos.

- - - - - The mortal frame
Could not ſupport the ſtrong æthereal flame.

Hence their bodily ſenſes were at once cloſed, and the ſenſes of their ſoul opened; ſo that they were in a manner ſpiritualized by the ſpirit of God. Thus we read of St. Peter (Acts x. 10) that he fell into a trance, ἐπε-

πεσεν

πεσεν ἐπ' αὐτον ἐκϛασις, *a ſtanding-without fell on him.* The deſcription of Balaam is very remarkable and explanatory; Numb. xxiv. 3, 4, *And he took up his parable and ſaid: Balaam the ſon of Beor hath ſaid; and the man, whoſe eyes are opened, hath ſaid; he hath ſaid, which heard the words of God, which ſaw the viſion of the Almighty, ſinking down, but having his eyes open.* Here we may obſerve (ver. 2) that the ſpirit of God came firſt upon him; then he *ſinks down*, נפל, nophel, as if his bodily ſenſes were at once locked up in ſleep; whence the Septuagint turn the word by ἐν ὑπνῳ, *in ſleep*, and our Engliſh tranſlators very rightly by, *falling into a trance.* In this ſleep his eyes are opened; for ſo the original has it, as well as the Greek tranſlation, ἀποκεκαλυμμενοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοι αὐτϖ, *his eyes are uncovered.* It is plain here, that his eyes are the eyes of his mind. Hence in ver. 3, he is called the man, whoſe eyes are opened, ὁ ἀληθινως ὁϱων, *that ſees really*, שתם העין, ſhethum hawajin, which Buxtorf turns thus: *cui oculi nunc* illuſtrati ſunt ad res futuras prævidendas, *whoſe eyes are now enlightened to foreſee things to come. There is a ſpirit in man*, ſaith Elihu (Job xxxii. 8) *and*

the ſpirit of the Almighty giveth them underſtanding. Here he intimates to us the operation of the ſpirit of God upon men's minds in thoſe viſions. Hence prophets are ſo often ſaid *to be in the ſpirit*, viz. under this influence of God's ſpirit. Hence a man only pretending to this inſpiration of God, is called *ſpirit*; 1 John iv. 1, 2, 3, *Beloved, believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits whether they are of God*; i. e. Believe not every man who claims divine inſpiration, but try theſe men whether they are of God; *becauſe*, as he adds, *many falſe prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the ſpirit of God*, i. e. the operation of God's holy ſpirit, or a man under that operation. *Every ſpirit* (i. e. man pretending to inſpiration) *that confeſſeth that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is of God*, is moved of true inſpiration of God. *And every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God; and this is that ſpirit of Antichriſt.* And hence to perceive what man, claiming inſpiration, had the true ſpirit of God, and who had not, is called by St. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 10) *a diſcerning* of ſpirits. In this caſe, therefore, we may almoſt uſe our Saviour's words,

John

John iii. 6, *He that is born of the flesh is flesh, and he that is born of the spirit is spirit.*

Many instances we find in Scripture, where the eye of the mind hath been thus enlightened, and men have been able to see beings, which otherwise would have been invisible to mortals. Thus, 2 Kings vi. we read that Elisha's servant, going forth early in the morning, saw a great army of their enemies, the Syrians, encompassing the city, and in his terror cries out, *Alas! my master, what shall we do? But Elisha bids him, fear not; for they that be with us be more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed,* as it follows, *and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw; and behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.* When God had opened his eyes, he could see the hosts of angels, which encompassed his master to secure him, with the same certainty as he saw the Syrians lying round the city to apprehend him.—Balaam, as we find, never perceived the angel, till *the Lord opened his eyes*; Numb. xxii. 31.—Job had also

alſo this eye of his mind opened. Job. xlii. 5, *I have heard of thee*, ſays he to God, *by the hearing of the EAR, but now mine eye ſeeth thee.* The knowledge of God had been delivered to him by the tradition of his forefathers; but he now clearly perceived his divine perfections. He had ſome light thrown in upon his mind, which carried its own evidence with it. He had a viſion allowed him, which it is difficult for us to form an exact notion of, who never felt ſuch; but to him it carried the clearneſs and certainty of light itſelf.

But the prophets not only were endued with this extraordinary ſight, but they ſaw things tranſacted in the heavens. *It came to paſs*, ſays the prophet Ezekiel, in the beginning of his prophecy, *as I was by the river Chebar, the heavens were opened* (which uſually introduced a divine viſion) *and I ſaw the viſions of God.* In the ſame manner (Rev. iv. 1) St. John tells us, that he *looked, and behold a door was opened in heaven; and the firſt voice which he heard, ſaid, Come up hither, and I will ſhew thee things which muſt be hereafter; and imme-*

immediately I was in the ſpirit, and behold a throne was ſet in heaven. The viſion deſcribed in the ſixth chapter of Iſaiah, is a very remarkable one, where the prophet ſees *the LORD ſitting upon his heavenly throne, high and lifted up, and that his train of angels filled the temple. Alſo,* ſays he, ver. 8, *I heard the voice of the Lord, ſaying, Whom ſhall I ſend? Then ſaid I, Here am I, ſend me.* And then he receives his commiſſion from God and the decrees of heaven. For the honour of our Bleſſed Redeemer, let us hear the commiſſion: *Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but underſtand not; and ſee ye indeed, but perceive not; make the heart of this people fat, and make their eyes heavy; and ſhut their eyes, leſt they ſee with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and underſtand with their heart, and convert and be healed.* This was the order of that God, who ſits on the throne of heaven, with all the armies of bliſs (ver. 3) adoring him.—But this bleſſed Being, this King of Angels, is expreſsly declared by St. John (chap. xii. ver. 39, 40, 41) to be our all-adorable Saviour. *Therefore they would not believe, becauſe that Eſaias ſaid again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart,*

heart, that they ſhould not ſee with their eyes, nor underſtand with their heart, and be converted, and I ſhould heal them. In ver. 37, it is manifeſt that the apoſtle is here ſpeaking of Chriſt, on whom they could not believe, and it is undeniable that he refers to the prophecy before-mentioned by Iſaiah; and his following words are greatly remarkable: *Theſe things ſaid Eſaias*, or Iſaiah, *when he ſaw his glory and ſpake of him.* The prophet ſaw his glory, ſaw all the angels of God worſhipping him, and propheſied alſo of him.—Let therefore the proud reaſoners of this world glory in their ſtrength of knowledge; but let the faithful ſubmit their thoughts to the truths revealed, and always worſhip him who is LORD and GOD. I ſhall not aſk pardon for this digreſſion, but return.

St. Paul, deſcribing his viſion, 2 Cor. xii. 2, tells us, that he was caught up into the third heaven, which third heaven he (ver. 4) calls *Paradiſe*, and there heard *unſpeakable words*, myſterious things, which he was unable to utter. His viſion, however, *made ſo ſtrong an impreſſion upon him, that whether he ſaw*

it

it in the body, or out of the body, he could not tell. He doubted whether his ſoul remained in the body, or was actually ſeparated from it for a time, and carried to paradiſe or heaven.—And whether the ſoul, in theſe viſions of the prophets, is ſeparated from the body or not, yet it is perhaps affected in the ſame manner as ſeparate ſouls are with impreſſions of things in the next world. It is plain that the thing was as certain and real to St. Paul, as if he had been actually tranſported to heaven or paradiſe, and had heard and ſeen things with his ears and eyes; for how elſe ſhould ſuch a doubt ariſe in his breaſt?—And, till we know more of the human ſoul, and what it is capable of; or how it may be affected by other ſpiritual beings, and eſpecially by its Almighty Creator; this ſcripture-account of prophetical revelation, is the beſt that we can expect in this world.

We have two repreſentations of thoſe divine conſultations, which are deſcribed in the Eaſtern figurative boldneſs, and may be conſidered in a parabolical light. The firſt we find 1 Kings xxii. 19, and following verſes.

verſes. *I ſaw the Lord*, ſays the prophet Micaiah, deſcribing his heavenly viſion, *ſitting on his throne, and all the hoſts of heaven ſtanding by, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord ſaid, Who ſhall perſuade Ahab, that he may go and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one ſaid on this manner, and another ſaid on that manner. And there came forth a ſpirit and ſtood before the Lord, and ſaid, I will perſuade him. And the Lord ſaid unto him, Wherewith? And he ſaid, I will go forth, and I will be a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he ſaid, Thou ſhalt perſuade him, and prevail alſo. Go forth and do ſo.* Now, though this conſultation was probably not real, but deſcribed only by the Eaſtern boldneſs; yet ſtill the ſubſtance or meaning of it was an infallible truth, viz. that Ahab's prophets propheſied lyes, being inſtigated by that wicked ſpirit, who was a lyar from the beginning, and the father of lyes; and the repreſentation of it was doubtleſs impreſſed upon the prophet's mind in viſion, and he was directed by God to uſe this account of the decrees of heaven, as it is plain from the ſolemn words which introduce it, viz. *Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord.*

Agree-

Agreeable to this account is that paſſage of Job, where we read that *there was a day, when the ſons of GOD came to preſent themſelves before the LORD, and Satan came alſo amongſt them to preſent himſelf before the LORD.* Here, as we ſee, is the ſame grand aſſembly held in the caſe of *Job*, as there was in the caſe of *Ahab;* the ſame hoſts of heaven, called here the *ſons of God*, preſenting themſelves before Jehovah, who in the viſion of Micaiah are ſaid *to ſtand on his right hand and on his left.* Here a wicked ſpirit appears amongſt them called *Satan*, or *the adverſary;* and there a *lying ſpirit;* both bent on miſchief, as far as God would give them leave; both ſubject to the controuling power of nature's univerſal Lord, and ſuffered only to anſwer the ends of his juſtice and providence.—Jacob ſaw, in a dream, a ladder which reached from earth to heaven, and the angels of God deſcending and aſcending upon it, continually employed in receiving and executing the orders of the Moſt High. Thus God in the figurative and viſionary relations of the Scripture, is, with juſt magnificence, deſcribed to ſurvey all things from his ſupreme throne in the heaven of heavens; to govern

govern his obedient angels with his golden ſceptre, and to commiſſion them for the good of mankind; while he controuls the malicious deſigns even of devils, and makes them the executioners of the decrees of his wiſdom and juſtice.

CHAP. XIII.

Proſeuchæ, or praying-houſes, in the very beginning of the Jewiſh ſtate.

TO vindicate, if poſſible, Micah's character from the charge of idolatry, and to open the condition of the Jewiſh church in the very beginning of their ſtate; we may obſerve that the Jews, beſides their temple at Jeruſalem (and before that, their tabernacle) had in every city and large town a ſynagogue; and in every village, and in ſome families of diſtinction, a proſeucha, or praying-houſe.

That there was a ſynagogue in every large town, we may plainly perceive by Acts xv. 21, where it is ſaid, that *Moſes* in old time *hath, in every city, them that preach him, being*

read in the ſynagogues every Sabbath-day. That there were *proſeuchæ*, or *ædes ſacræ*, may be collected from various places of Scripture. The ſanctuary at Sichem, which is mentioned Joſh. xxiv. 26, was plainly a proſeucha, or praying-houſe, which had been firſt ſet aſide for a place of divine worſhip by Abraham (Gen. xii. 6, 7); though probably it might be fallen into decay, and had been repaired by the Iſraelites (at leaſt by the men of Ephraim, in whoſe territory it was) after the conqueſt of the land. Hence (Joſh. xxiv. 1) Joſhua gathered all the tribes of Iſrael to Shechem, and there he and the elders of Iſrael, and their heads, and their judges, and their officers, preſented themſelves before God. Here again, ſince it was a place more holy than others (Judg. ix. 6), the men gathered together to make Abimelech king: for it was an ancient cuſtom (2 Kings xi. 13, 14) to anoint kings in places conſecrated to God, if ſuch a place was at hand.—Hence alſo we hear of ſo many Levites coming to Mount Ephraim, where they attended on the ſervice of God: for Shechem (1 Chron. vi. 67) was in Mount Ephraim, and given to the Levites, 1 Chron. vi.

vi. 64, 67.—Yea, in this place, a praying-houſe continued to the times of Chriſt.—Epiphanius,* a Jew, born and bred in Paleſtine, in his tract againſt the Maſſalian heretics, after he hath told us that the Maſſaliani built themſelves houſes, or large places like the places of market of the ancients, which they called proſeuchæ, goes on thus: *That the Jews of old (as alſo the Samaritans) had certain places without the city for prayer, which they called proſeucha's. This appears out of the Acts of the Apoſtles, where Lydia, a ſeller of purple, is ſaid to have met with the apoſtle Paul, and to have heard him preaching in that place, which place, in Acts* xvi. 13, *is ſaid to be a place of prayer.* He next informs us, *That there is ſtill at Sichem, now called Neapolis, above a mile without the city, a proſeucha,* or place of prayer, *like a theatre which was built without a roof, and in the open air, by the Samaritans, who affected to imitate the Jews in all things.* Shechem, or Sichem, or Sychem (for the place is the ſame), was manifeſtly a place of prayer, called therefore the ſanctuary of God (Joſh. xxiv. 26) in the days of Joſhua, while the ark of God was then at Shiloh.

* See Mr. Mede.

Another of these houses of God, or praying-houses, we may well grant to be at Mizpeh, where *the chiefs of the tribes of Israel presented themselves in the assembly of the people of God*, Judg. xx. 1, 2. Here the ark of God seemed to be, in the time, when the things, related in this chapter, were transacted; at least it seems clearly intimated, in ver. 27 of chap. xx. compared with ver. 1 and 5 of chap. xxi. Hence Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 5) says, *Gather all Israel to* Mizpeh, *and I will pray for you unto the Lord.* We could as fully prove that praying-houses were at Bethel and Gilgah (1 Sam. vii. 16) where Samuel came in his circuits, as well as at Shiloh, 1 Sam. iii. 15, where Samuel is expressly said *to open the doors of the house of the Lord*, but that the task is unnecessary. The reasonableness of the thing itself is a sufficient proof. For when the Israelites were settled in the Holy Land, doubtless they built some places of divine worship in every town and village, where they might meet together to offer up their prayers to God. Since the ark could be but in one place of the Holy Land, it was impossible that they could all keep the Sabbath-day *there*; and there-

fore reaſon itſelf would inſtruct us, that they prepared ſome places, where perſons, who lived near together, might preſent themſelves before God. Theſe places, let me obſerve, were not places of ſacrifice. That privilege, except when a prophet was commiſſioned on an extraordinary occaſion, was reſerved (Lev. i.) for the place of the tabernacle.—Indeed we may remark, that though theſe houſes, as being devoted to holy uſes, are called houſes of God; yet God is not ſaid to dwell in them, as in the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple; and therefore came the cuſtom among the Jews of praying (either ſingly or in their congregation) in the houſes of prayer, with their faces turned towards the tabernacle, or the temple. Hence we hear, in 1 Kings viii. 30, 35, 38, of the aſſembly's praying towards the temple; and Daniel, while a captive in Babylon, prayed with his face turned towards Jeruſalem, and in conſequence towards the temple.—From this account it appears, that Micah and his mother did a very charitable thing in providing a houſe of prayer.

What ſeems to incline men to an averſion againſt houſes of prayer, is this: God (Deut. xii. 5) orders all the tribes of Iſrael *to aſſemble to the place which he ſhould chooſe out of all their tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation; there to come and bring all their burnt-offerings, and ſacrifices, and tithes, and heave-offerings, and vows, and free-will-offerings, and firſtlings of their herds and of their flocks.* And ver. 13, God orders his people *to take heed that they offer not their burnt-offerings in any other place.*—Would theſe men, however, conſider, that theſe places were deſigned for prayer only, and not for ſacrifice; and that ſacrifices, and all vows and offerings, were, notwithſtanding theſe houſes of prayer, always carried to the tabernacle; they would reconcile their own difficulties from theſe texts, and admit the force and truth of the former arguments.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Praying-houſes called houſes of God.

A PRAYING-HOUSE, and alſo a ſynagogue, is, in Scripture-language, ſtiled a houſe of God, or God's ſanctuary, as well as the tabernacle, afterwards the temple. The praying-houſe at Shechem (Joſh. xxiv. 26) is called the ſanctuary of the Lord; and Micah, we read here, Judg. xvii. 5, had an houſe of God; which evidently appears to be a proſeucha, or little praying-houſe, for himſelf and his neighbours. His neighbours purſuing with him after the Danites, ſhews that they were ſomewhat intereſted in Micah's furniture, and conſequently frequented his houſe of prayer. Indeed, ſince theſe buildings were dedicated to the divine worſhip, they are properly ſtiled houſes of God. Hence theſe holy houſes, or ſanctuaries, as well as

ſynagogues, are comprehended in that complaint of David, Pſal. lxxiv. 7, 8, that *the enemy had burnt up all the houſes of God in the land:* and Pſal. lxxxiii. 12, that *the Moabites and Iſhmaelites*, &c. *had conſpired together, and ſaid, Let us take to ourſelves* the houſes of God *in poſſeſſion.* In David's time, therefore, there were houſes of God, the deſtruction of which he looked upon to be a very great calamity; and by that expreſſion, *all the houſes of God in the land*, we may ſee that ſuch houſes were built throughout the country, as places of prayer and devotion. Indeed, without ſuch houſes, it would be difficult to conceive, how the Sabbath-day could be well obſerved, or even the knowledge of God retained amongſt them.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Praying-houſes furniſhed in imitation of the temple.

THEY not only had ſuch houſes, as it has been abundantly proved, but theſe proſeuchæ, or praying-houſes, were furniſhed ſomewhat in imitation of the tabernacle, afterwards the temple, at Jeruſalem. A proſeucha, by comparing authors * and things, ſeems to have been a plot of ground encompaſſed with a wall, or ſome encloſure. All the ſpace within this incloſure was called the houſe of prayer, or houſe of God. On the inſide of this incloſure a grove of trees was generally planted; and in the grove was probably a *delubrum*, or chapel, *in* or rather *before* which was an altar, and ſome utenſils like thoſe of the temple, or tabernacle. This fur-

* See Mr. Mede, Lewis's Hebrew Antiquities, &c.

niture

niture gave it ſome reſemblance of that place, which was chiefly ſanctified by God's glory.

The incloſure appears from the words of Epiphanius already cited. The planting of groves in them may be collected from Philo Judæus, who, relating the barbarous uſage of the Gentiles at Alexandria againſt the Jews, there dwelling in the time of Caius, ſaith, that the citizens of that vaſt city συνταξαμενοι, σφη πολυανθρωποταλα των προσευχων· πολλαι δε εισι καθ' ἑκαστον τμημα της πολεως· τας μεν ἐδενδροτομησαν· τας δε αὐτοις θεμελιοις κατεσκαψαν, "*drawing up together in large companies*, cut down the trees of the proſeuchæ, or praying-houſes, *of which there are a great number in every diviſion of the town, and demoliſhed others to the very foundations.*" Hence Juvenal, in his ſixth Satire, calls a Jewiſh prieſteſs *interpres legum Solymarum, magna ſacerdos arboris*, "an explainer of the law of Moſes, a great prieſteſs of the tree;" for the Jews built proſeuchæ, or ſome ſorry imitation of them, in that poet's time, in Italy; and, by pretending to divine oracles, carried on in them a ſort of a begging fortune-telling trade; and, in particular, had hired a grove

and chapel conſecrated to Egeria and the Muſes, for this purpoſe.

Hic ubi nocturnæ Numæ conſtituebat amicæ,
Nunc ſacri fontis nemus, & delubra locantur
Judæis, quorum cophinus fœnumq; ſupellex.
Omnis enim populo mercedem pendere juſſa eſt
Arbor & ejectis mendicat ſylva camœnis.

Where Numa met Egeria — heav'nly maid! —
And in wiſe conſultations nightly ſtaid;
The grove and chapel's let to Jews, who lay
Their wealth in baſket mean, or wiſp of hay.
To pay its poll each tree muſt beg around,
While baniſh'd muſes fly the grating ſound.

David certainly refers to theſe proſeuchæ in Pſal. lii. 8. *I am like a green olive-tree in the houſe of God;* or, more properly, in *an* houſe of God. And again, in Pſal. xcii. 11, 12, *The righteous ſhall flouriſh like a palm-tree, and ſhall ſpread abroad like a cedar in Lebanon. Such, as be planted in an houſe of the Lord, ſhall flouriſh*

in

in the courts of the houſe of our God. And that they had ſome furniture *in* or *before* their chapel, it appears from this houſe of God, which Micah endowed, and will appear more fully hereafter. But here it may be aſked, whether this planting of trees within their houſes of God (for the whole encloſure, as I before obſerved, had that name) does not contradict that command of God, given in Deut. xvi. 21, 22, *Thou ſhalt not plant a grove of any trees near unto the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou ſhalt make thee; neither ſhalt thou ſet thee up a pillar* (or ſtatue) *which the Lord thy God hateth.* I ſhall prove hereafter, that many prohibitions of this kind are to be underſtood in a reſtrained ſenſe, and are ſuppoſed to have theſe words underſtood after them: *ſo as to convert them or it to idolatrous purpoſes.* This will be ſeen to be true in images ſet up in houſes of prayer, in pillars or στηλαι, in keeping teraphim. For the preſent, we ſhall only obſerve, that though it was not lawful to plant a grove of trees near the place of the altar before the tabernacle, yet it was lawful, and cuſtomary too, to plant groves of trees within the incloſure, which went by the name

of

of a proſeucha. *The altar of the Lord thy God*, in the Scripture cited, infers the altar for ſacrifice, which altars in praying-houſes were not. They were ſymbols only, that the praying perſons were in covenant with God, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter.—Indeed, Philo Judæus, in his book of the Law of Allegories, has an obſervation which is ingenious, and by chance true. Ζητησειε δε αν τις, &c. *A perſon may enquire*, ſays he, *wherefore, ſince it is both juſt and righteous to imitate the works of God, that I am forbidden to plant a grove by the altar; whereas God himſelf planted Paradiſe. For the law ſays, Thou ſhalt not plant to thyſelf a grove, viz. every tree near the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou ſhalt make.* And the reſult of his anſwer is this, that you may plant fruitful trees, but not a grove conſiſting of a mixture of trees, fruitful or unfruitful. Εν αλσει γαρ κ᾽ αγριας υλης εστι κ᾽ ημερω δενδρα, &c. for *In a grove are both wild and mild trees, but we ought not to mix fruitful with unfruitful.* As this author was himſelf a Jew, this bears great probability of truth. His tranſlation is certainly preferable to ours; for, in the original, it is not *a grove of any trees*, but *a grove*, viz. every tree.

tree. In ſuch caſe, we ſhall ſee a reaſon why the olive-tree is mentioned by David as planted in the houſe of God; and the very oaks with which their ſacred groves were chiefly planted, have been found, by all travellers, to be of that ſpecies, which the Romans named *æſculus*, or rather *eſculus*, becauſe in that country in particular its fruits are very eſculent and eatable.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

A Levite was prieſt in the proſeucha, with his ephod.

A Levite was prieſt in theſe proſeuchæ, who wore an ephod, though not of fine-twined linen. Theſe proſeuchæ were not for ſacrifice, but for prayer only, as their name implies; and the Levites were deſigned by God to be the praying prieſts. To preſerve the religion of God, it was neceſſary that there ſhould be ſanctuaries (as theſe holy houſes are called Lev. xxvi. 31); and if there were ſanctuaries, it was neceſſary that there ſhould be prieſts. And that the Levites were choſen to be the praying prieſts, we may ſee in Deut. x. 8. *At that time the Lord ſeparated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to ſtand before the Lord to miniſter*

miniſter unto him, and to bleſs in his name unto this day. Some of the Levites waited before the tabernacle, and others muſt therefore ſojourn; and thoſe provincial and ſojourning Levites were to be received at the altar on their return, as we may ſee in Deut. xviii. 6. *If a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Iſrael, where he ſojourned, and come with all the deſire of his mind unto the place which the Lord ſhall chooſe, then he ſhall miniſter in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which ſtand there before the Lord.* Is it not plain from this, that there were travelling Levites deſigned by God from the very beginning of the Jewiſh ſtate? The Levites indeed were not permitted to offer ſacrifice at the altar of the Lord God, as we ſhall obſerve hereafter; but they were deſigned, when the tabernacle and ark was fixed, to be the praying prieſts. This is very plainly intimated in Numb. xviii. 2, 3, and following verſes; and in thoſe places of Scripture, where we read of *Levites within their gates*, Deut. xii. 12, whom they were not to forſake in whatever part of the country they lived, Deut. xii. 19. Hence, when a murder was com-

committed nigh any city throughout the land, the prieſts, the ſons of Levi, were to come near (for them the Lord had choſen to miniſter unto him, and to bleſs in the name of the Lord) Deut. xxi. 5, and to decide any controverſy. Hence, in fine, they are ſo often called prieſts, as in Joſh. iii. 3, 17. It follows, as I obſerved before, that if the worſhip of God was to be celebrated, that there muſt be houſes of worſhip and prieſts; and ſince the ſons of Aaron were wholly employed about the ſervice of the tabernacle, the other Levites muſt ſerve in other houſes of prayer.

It may be here aſked, if theſe Levites did not ſucceed, or find employment, what proviſion was made for them? On which we may obſerve, that the tenth part of the products of the ground, or of herds and flocks, was conſecrated to God, or reſerved for the uſe of his prieſts. Lev. xxvii. 32, *Concerning the tithe of the herd or of the flock, even of whatſoever paſſeth under the rod, the tenth ſhall be holy unto the Lord.* — Where we may obſerve the cuſtom of tithing the lambs or calves amongſt

the Jews; which was moſt probably this: They incloſed, in a fold or pen with a little door, all the lambs or calves, and placed the dams on the outſide. At the entrance ſtood the keeper, either ſhepherd or herdſman, with a rod coloured with oker in his hand, which he held over them in numbering as they paſſed; and every tenth calf or lamb, which came out at the call of its dam, belonged to the Lord, whether good or bad. Theſe tithes we read, Numb. xviii. 24, 26, were aſſigned for the uſe of the Levites, with this reſtriction only, that they were ordered to take out the tithe of the tithe for the ſacrificing prieſts of the houſe of Aaron. Theſe tithes were all brought to the place where God's ark was, and there proper diviſions made; and if the Levites returned from ſojourning, there was a preſent maintenance for them; Deut. xviii. 6, 7, 8.

Theſe Levites had ephods of common linen, or *linteum;* for though an ephod made of fine-twined linen, or *byſſus*, was a garment to be made for the high-prieſts only; yet an ephod of common linen might be worn by any man

man that was consecrated to the service of God. Thus Samuel (1 Sam. ii. 18) is said *to minister unto the Lord, girded with a linen ephod.* Thus Doeg (1 Sam. xxii. 18) is said *to fall upon the priests, and to slay in one day fourscore and five persons, that wore a linen ephod.* Some of these fourscore and five persons were doubtless Levites; whose office it was, as inferior priests, to assist the other priests at the tabernacle. The ephod was plainly the distinguishing garment of every priest; and hence we see that Micah acted agreeably to the will of God and religious customs established, both in entertaining a Levite as his priest, and providing an ephod for him, as a distinguishing vestment of a priest usual in those days.

CHAP. XVII.

Many places in Scripture explained from Levitical cuſtoms.

FROM theſe travelling Levites we may ſee the exact completion of two prophecies; the one recorded in Gen. xlix. 5, 6, 7. *Simeon and Levi are brethren. Inſtruments of cruelty are in their habitations. O my ſoul, come not thou into their ſecret; unto their aſſembly, mine honour, be not thou united; for in their anger they ſlew a man, and in their ſelf-will they digged down a wall. Curſed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel. I will divide them in Jacob, and ſcatter them in Iſrael.* Jacob here points out the deſperate murder committed by theſe two brethren (Gen. xxxiv. 25, 26) on Hamor and Shechem, and all the males of their city. And his prophecy

of their being ſcattered, was fulfilled; for Simeon (Joſh. xix. 1) had ſcattered towns in Judah allowed for his ſettlement; and the Levites, we find, were in a great meaſure travelling Levites, going about ſometimes from place to place, and ſeeking to be employed in ſome houſe of prayer, and ſo were diſperſed through the whole land. Hence, according to the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 7, *Levi too was divided in Jacob, and ſcattered in Iſrael.*

The other prophecy which is expreſſed by this order of travelling Levites, is in Deut. xxxiii. 8, 9, 10. *And of Levi he ſaid, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim* * *be with thy holy one* [in Hebrew, with thy holy man, viz. Aaron, or rather Levi, as repreſentative of all prieſts; *with which Aaron*, or with which Levi, as expreſſed by the prieſts in general, the Iſraelites ſtrove at Maſſah, Numb. xx. 2, 13. Exod. xvii. 7.] *whom thou didſt prove at Maſſah, and with whom thou didſt ſtrive*, or rather, whom

* Whoever conſiders the ſignification of Urim and Thummim, viz. of *Lights* and *Perfections*, may think that St. James, chap. i. 17, had the prayer of Moſes here in view, when he aſſures us, that every good and every *perfect* gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father *of lights*.

thou cauſedſt to contend, *at Meribah. Who ſaid*, or who ſhall ſay, *unto his father and his mother, I have not ſeen him, neither ſhall he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children. For they have obſerved* (ſhall obſerve) *thy word, and kept* (keep) *thy covenant. They ſhall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Iſrael thy law; they ſhall put incenſe before thee, and whole burnt-ſacrifice upon thy altar**. Here Moſes indeed includes all the deſcendants of Levi, both the high-prieſts in the line of Aaron, and the Levites properly ſo called. However, ſince the Levites left often their parents, brethren, and children, to ſeek ſome proſeucha, which wanted a man of their order, Moſes here plainly deſcribes their departure from their family; and if we convert the eaſtern deſcription into our idiom of ſpeech, makes them ſay to their friends, *You are to me no more than*

* I here explain the words according to the prophetic intention; for the words alſo refer to a thing paſt, when Aaron and the tribe of Levi did not join in murmuring againſt God and Moſes at Maſſah nor Meribah, with the reſt of the people; yea, the Levites did not join with the people in making the golden calf, but expiated the ſin with the blood of their own relations. Hence God gives that eulogium of Levi, Mal. ii. 4, 5, 6.

ſtrangers;

ſtrangers; for I am about to leave you, in order to ſerve God in ſome houſe of prayer.

To this cuſtom of leaving their deareſt friends amongſt theſe provincial Levites, our Saviour refers, when he ſays, that *if any man come to me, and hate not* (i. e. flight not, and leave, in reſpect of me) *his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and ſiſters, yea, and his own life alſo, he cannot be my diſciple;* Luke xiv. 26; and in ver. 33, *Whoſoever he be of you, that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my diſciple.* And in Matt. x. 37, *He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth ſon or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me.* If it is true, alſo, what the Jews with great probability affirm, that theſe travelling Levites always took with them a ſtaff and a purſe, and a copy of the law; then we ſhall ſee the propriety and force of theſe proverbial expreſſions of our Saviour; who, propoſing a ſpeedy ſetting out, orders his diſciples to *provide neither purſe nor ſtaff, nor victuals for the way.* And it is not to be doubted, but the *ſhaking off the duſt of their*

feet againſt towns and houſes which would not receive them, is deducible from ſome obſcure cuſtom amongſt thoſe Levitical travellers; who, by that ceremony, teſtified their great inhoſpitality, as if they would have grudged them even the duſt of the ground; or rather, would not afford water to waſh the duſt off their feet; which water was the firſt and moſt unexpenſive token of hoſpitality.

Philo Judæus, *in his Book of the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain*, mentions this voluntary departure of the Levites from their friends for the ſake of publiſhing the law of Moſes; and as this paſſage illuſtrates what has been ſaid, it well deſerves a tranſlation. Ἄξιον δε μη παρεργως σκεψασθαι τι δηποτε τας πολεις των Λευιτων ἀνηκε τοις φυγασι, &c. "*We ought alſo carefully to conſider, why God ſhould grant the cities of the Levites to thoſe who fled for involuntary murther; permitting the profane to cohabit with the moſt ſacred men. We muſt firſt allege, what is conſequent on obſervations already made, that a good man is a redemption for a bad man; ſo that ſinners with good reaſon fly to ſacred perſons in order to be purified. Beſides, the Levites reaſonably entertain wan-*

wanderers, as being in ſome degree wanderers themſelves. For as the fliers are forced from their country; ſo the Levites leave children, parents, brethren, every thing that is moſt near and dear; that for a mortal they may obtain an immortal inheritance. Here is the difference, that the one are baniſhed, though againſt their inclination, for a crime which againſt their inclination they committed; the other wander voluntarily for the love of what is beſt." This conduct of the Levites fully explains our Saviour's orders, when he bids men do, for the ſake of publiſhing the Goſpel, that better adminiſtration, what the Levites, for the ſake of the law of Moſes, did with free-will, when they left their neareſt and deareſt friends and abodes for the ſake of it.—This obſervation will alſo ſet our Saviour's own conduct in a juſt light in ſome occurrences, in which annotators have groſsly ſtumbled. He conſidered himſelf, in the execution of his great commiſſion, as a man thus divorced from parents, whoſe authority, after the entrance upon the miniſtry, plainly ceaſed from over the prieſts and Levites, if it interrupted the performance of their great office. Hence, as a man diſengaged from his rela-

relations and abode, he tells the ſcribe, Matt. viii. 20. that *he had not where to lay his head*; and ver. 22, *would not ſuffer a diſciple to return and bury his father*, ſince that diſciple ſhould have addicted himſelf to his goſpel only. Hence, Matt. xii. 46, 47, &c. he diſregards the call of his mother and brethren, when it interrupted the execution of his office, and ſeemed, as propheſied of true Levites on theſe occaſions, *not to acknowledge them*, Deut. xxxiii. 9. but declared that *whoever did the will of his Father which was in heaven, the ſame was his brother, and ſiſter, and mother.* Hence I ſhould be inclined to read, with Gregory Nyſſen, the words in John ii. 4, thus, *Woman, what have I to do with thee? Is not mine hour yet come?* which in our language would ſtand thus, ſuppoſing that his mother intimated their want of wine, either willing that he ſhould ſupply it by a miracle, or, what is more likely, intimating to her ſon that it was proper to withdraw themſelves, *Mother, why do you lay your injunctions on me? Is not my miniſterial office begun?*. As if he had ſaid, " Why do you hint to me, mother, that " it is time to withdraw becauſe the wine is " ſpent?

" ſpent? Is not my office begun? and can-
" not I therefore reſtore ſome by a miracle?"
It is certain, that his mother underſtood his words, as if he had intimated that he would ſupply their defect in wine, ſince ſhe, on his anſwer, bids the ſervants to obey his orders.—When he was amongſt the doctors in the Temple, and his mother ſought him, and having found him, mildly rebuked him for leaving her and his father and friends, he replied—*How is it that ye ſought me? wiſt ye not, that I muſt be about my Father's buſineſs?*" This reply we read, Luke ii. 50. that his parents at that time underſtood not.—But he afterwards, doubtleſs, revealed to them, that he ſhould ſoon leave their care and power over him, and enter upon his miniſtry. And this anſwer to his mother in the beginning of his miniſterial office, ſeems to be to the ſame purport. This interpretation is, I ſuppoſe, new: but recommends itſelf, if examined according to the approved cuſtoms amongſt God's miniſters under the law.

Since perſons alſo, who had dedicated themſelves to the ſervice of God, were conſidered

ſidered by themſelves and others as alienated from their parents and relations, we may trace out, perhaps, the origin of that obſcure tradition of the Scribes and Phariſees mentioned Matt. xv. 3, 4, &c. *He anſwered and ſaid unto them, Why do you alſo tranſgreſs the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, ſaying, Honour thy father and mother, and he that curſeth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye ſay, Whoſoever ſhall ſay to his father or mother, It is a gift, by whatſoever thou mighteſt have been profited by me, he ſhall even by no means honour his father and mother. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.* This is the exact tranſlation of the words in the original; whereon we may obſerve,

1. That τιμαω ſignifies not only to honour, in the ſacred writings, but *to entertain handſomely, or to relieve handſomely*, or, in one word, *to take a decent care of*. Thus, 1 Tim. v. 3, we may turn the words in this ſenſe; *Relieve handſomely widows, that are widows indeed*; as we may ſee, if we compare this verſe with 1 Tim. v. 16. where επαρκεω, *to relieve ſufficiently*,

ciently, is uſed for τιμαω, *to honour*. In ſhort, כבד chabad, in Hebrew, τιμη in Greek, and ſometimes *honos* in Latin, may ſignify *an handſome preſent*, whether it be a *maintenance*, *entertainment*, or *reward*. Thus Acts xxviii. 10, Οἳ πολλαις τιμαις ἐτιμησαν ἡμας, *who entertained us with many entertainments in an handſome manner*, viz. while we ſtaid; *and*, *when we departed*, *they laded us with ſuch things as were neceſſary*. The words *medico honos debetur*, in Cicero, mean that *a phyſician deſerves a handſome fee*. And *Let the elders*, *which rule well*, *be counted worthy of a double honour*, in 1 Tim. v. 17, might be better turned by, *Let the elders*, *which rule well*, *have a double maintenance allowed to them*; for the apoſtle ſeems to have reſpect to the double portion allowed to the eldeſt brother among the Jews. Hence alſo ἀπονεμειν τιμην, &c. *to give honour unto the wife*, *as unto the weaker veſſel*, 1 Pet. iii. 17, may be alſo turned by, *to afford a handſome maintenance to the wife*, *as a weaker veſſel*, or one who is dependent on her huſband, as not being equally capable of providing for herſelf. Hence our church catechiſm rightly paraphraſes the words *honour thy father and mother*, by *love*, *honour*,

nour, and ſuccour thy father and mother. The words therefore in Matt. xv. 4, 6, might be better tranſlated, *Honourably relieve thy father and mother;* and, *He ſhall even by no means honourably relieve his father and mother.*

2dly, We may obſerve, that the Scribes and Phariſees not only would have perſons devoted to God's ſervice to be eſtranged from their parents, ſo that their parents ſhould have no farther juriſdiction over them; but that they excepted things alſo devoted to God, from that right which parents, by the commandment of God, had otherwiſe to them. They ſeem to have perſuaded their followers, that, though they were, otherwiſe, obliged to provide for their parents, in obedience to God's command; yet, if they would leave their ſubſtance, probably at their death, to the uſe of the temple-miniſtry, they might be free from that injunction. This any man will ſee to be the plain beginning of this tradition, who knows that קרבן, corban, (Mark vii. 11) that is, a gift, ſignifies always *an oblation to God.* Therefore (Matt. xv. 5) we may, according to the original Hebrew, turn thus:

It

It is dedicated as to whatſoever thou mighteſt have been relieved by me.

Thus theſe ſons of rapine and avarice made the religion of the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, patronize that cruelty and ingratitude to parents, which an honeſt heathen would be ſhocked to hear. Heſiod only dreads, leſt the growing iniquity of the world ſhould arrive at ſo unnatural a wickedneſs.

Αιψα δε γηρασκοντας ατιμησουσι τοκηας,
Μεμψονται δ' αρα τους χαλεποις βαζοντ' επεεσσι
Σχετλιοι, ουδε θεων οπιν ειδοτες· ουδε μεν οιγε
Γηροντεσσι τοκευσιν απο θρεπτηρια δοιεν.

Here βαζουτε, in the dual number, agrees with τους τοκηας in the plural, which concord is allowable amongſt the Greeks.

Sons aged parents ſoon will diſregard,
Nor their paſt cares with honours due reward;
And when, with harſher words, they angry chide,
Will call them peeviſh dotards, and deride.

Vile

Vile wretches!—to ſome fearful vengeance giv'n!
Who ſlight th' inſpecting eye of righteous heav'n;
Who, to requite, ungratefully forbear,
Their aged fathers pains, their aged mothers care.

Returns for nouriſhment and education paid to parents, are called θρεπτηρια, and by Homer, θρεπτρα, who, bemoaning the untimely fate of the young handſome Simoiſius, adds this, as an aggravation to his unhappy lot, that he was deprived of rendering a recompence to his parents by his early death.

- - - - - - Ουδε τοκευσι
Θρεπτρα φιλοις απεδωκε· μινυνθαδιῳ δε οι αιων
Επλετ' υπ' Αιαντι μεγαθυμω δηρι δαμεντι.

By him unpaid, his parents' cares remain.
So ſhort his date!—by valiant Ajax ſlain.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Levites no ſacrificing prieſts in the Jewiſh church. Laymen not to be prieſts in the Chriſtian church, according to a prophecy.

NO man, not even a Levite, could take upon him that part of the prieſtly office, which conſiſted in attendance upon the altar of God in the tabernacle or temple, ſo as to ſacrifice or to offer incenſe. This appears from the deſtruction of Korah, the Levite, for attempting ſuch a thing. The Levites, we find, in Numb. xvi. 10, muſt not ſeek the prieſthood in that ſenſe. They were empowered, indeed, to pray and explain the law in their houſes of prayer, and ſo are called prieſts in Deut. xviii. 1, 3. Joſh. iii. 3, 17. and xviii. 7, and in other places probably of Scripture.—If we enquire by what preſumptive right Korah invaded the prieſthood, we

ſhall find that it was occaſioned partly by his miſtaking one text of Scripture; by which place he thought that *he and every Iſraelite* had an equal right to take upon him that office with Aaron and his ſons. The place upon which Korah and his company grounded their preſumption, is in Exod. xix. 3, 4, &c. *Thus ſhalt thou ſay to the houſe of Jacob, and tell the children of Iſrael: Ye have ſeen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles wings, and brought you unto myſelf. Now therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye ſhall be unto me a peculiar treaſure above all people, and ye ſhall be unto me a kingdom of prieſts, and an holy nation.* This text the *unlearned* and *unſtable* Korah *wreſted unto his own deſtruction.* He thought that all the people were ſanctified by God's preſence in the camp; and, as Moſes has it, Deut. vii. 6, that *all Iſrael was an holy people to the Lord their God.* He imagined that every Iſraelite had a right to the prieſthood, becauſe the Iſraelites were ſaid to be *a kingdom of prieſts, and an holy nation.* This appears from the application which he makes of theſe words in Numb. xvi. 3, *Ye take too much upon you,* ſay

Korah

Korah and his confederates to Moſes and Aaron, *ſeeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them. Wherefore then lift ye up yourſelves above the congregation of the Lord?* Thus Korah made the whole nation at once a *kingdom of prieſts*, not in holineſs of life, according to the true meaning of the text, but in attendance upon the altar; and, with his companions, adventured to offer incenſe before God. Their error God rebuked by a moſt fearful judgment; and ordered their very cenſers to be made broad plates for the altar, that they might be there for a memorial unto the children of Iſrael, *that no ſtranger, which is not of the ſeed of Aaron, come near to offer incenſe before the Lord, that they be not as Korah and his company.*

St. Peter, in his 1 Ep. ii. 5, writes thus to all Chriſtians in general: *Ye alſo as lively ſtones are built up a ſpiritual houſe, a holy prieſthood, to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices acceptable to God by Jeſus Chriſt.* And in his 9th verſe, he ſtiles all Chriſtians *a choſen generation, a royal prieſthood.* But is it not a great and preſumptuous miſtake in theſe men, who affirm from theſe

texts, that every Chriſtian has an equal right to the prieſtly office without a regular ordination? Chriſtians are *prieſts*, as the Iſraelites were, *in holineſs of life*, if they walk worthy of the vocation whereunto they are called; but not prieſts attending on the altar. Chriſtians may offer up *ſpiritual ſacrifices*, the ſacrifice of a contrite ſpirit, the ſacrifice of thankſgiving, and the incenſe of prayer and praiſe; but they muſt not preſume to adminiſter ſacraments in the church. St. John, Rev. i. 6, tells us, that *Chriſt hath now made us kings and prieſts unto God;* i. e. kings and prieſts in a ſpiritual ſenſe, in governing our paſſions, conquering vice, and offering up the ſacrifice of a good life. Chriſtians muſt not pretend, from ſuch a text, that they are all empowered to take on them the kingly power, and govern the civil affairs of ſtate, becauſe they are ſtiled ſpiritually kings; no more muſt they preſume to conduct the eccleſiaſtical affairs of the church, becauſe they are ſtiled ſpiritually prieſts. Chriſtians are *kings and prieſts unto God*, but not kings and prieſts of the earth. Men who profeſs and practiſe Chriſtianity are ἱερεις, in St. Peter, *ſacrificers;* but

but the preachers with him are biſhops, elders, paſtors, rulers, teachers, miniſters, in the houſe of God. The Chriſtians whom St. Peter writes to, are ſtiled by him, babes new born; but perſons ordained to preach the goſpel, are every where by him ſtiled elders and fathers. Chriſtians who truly embrace the goſpel, are the ſons of God, and babes in Chriſt; churches are branches of the family of Chriſt; and perſons ordained and ſet over them are ſtewards over thoſe branches of the family, and diſpenſers of the myſtery of the goſpel.—To make the kingly or prieſtly office common, every one muſt know, on the leaſt conſideration, would introduce confuſion into ſtate and church.—But God is not the God of confuſion, but of order, as in all churches of the ſaints. Thus therefore St. Peter is to be explained: *Ye Chriſtians are an holy prieſthood*, not in adminiſtering the ſacrament and preaching the word of God, but in offering to God, through the interceſſion of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſpiritual ſacrifice of true repentance and a good life. Thus we ſee, that Chriſtians are prieſts to God, to offer up ſpiritual ſacrifices of a contrite heart and

broken ſpirit, but not the ſacrifices of the temple; in the ſame manner as Levites might pray and be devout in houſes of prayer, but were to be cut off, if they touched the proper duty of the altar in the tabernacle.

It will not be looked upon as quite foreign to the preſent ſubject, if we eſtabliſh this diſtinction of the preaching prieſthood of men regularly ordained to adminiſter the ſacraments, and of the ſpiritual prieſthood of all Chriſtians in general, from a prophecy of Iſaiah, who (Iſ. lxvi. 20, 21) has this remarkable prediction of the Chriſtian church: *They ſhall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord, as the children of Iſrael bring an offering in a clean veſſel unto the houſe of the Lord.* Here is the general admiſſion of all Chriſtians for ſpiritual prieſts. Out of them we find, in the next verſe, ſome are to be ſelected for the adminiſtration of ſacraments and public prayers; *And I will alſo take of them for prieſts, and for Levites, ſaith the Lord.* God promiſes *to take of them, excerpere quoſdam ex illis*, as the original may be juſtly turned, *to take out ſome from-among them*; for the prepoſition here uſed has

has the ſignification of *from-amongſt*. And *I will alſo take prieſts* for the adminiſtration of the ſacraments, and *Levites* for public prayer *from-amongſt them*. God therefore propoſes to ſelect ſome amongſt them for prieſts, not to make them all prieſts; ſince that would introduce a diſorder ſufficient to ſubvert his own worſhip.

CHAP. XIX.

Altars in praying-houſes, but not for ſacrifice.

THAT they had altars in theſe houſes of prayer, we may ſafely collect from an altar built, and probably afterwards incloſed, in ſome large proſeuchæ, by the Reubenites and Gadites and the half-tribe of Manaſſeh, on the borders of Jordan, as it is recorded Joſh. xxii. 10, 11, and following verſes; which altar, we there find, was not built for ſacrifice, but as a ſymbol that they were in allegiance to the God of heaven. *The Lord God of Gods*, ſay theſe Reubenites, &c. *the Lord God of Gods, he knoweth.—If it be in rebellion that we have built an altar, to turn from following the Lord; or if to offer thereon burnt-offering or meat-offering; or if to offer peace-offer-*

ings

ings thereon, let the Lord himſelf require it.—And if we have not rather done it for fear of this thing, ſaying, In time to come, your children might ſpeak to our children, and ſay, What have you to do with the Lord God of Iſrael? For the Lord hath made Jordan a border between us and you. Ye children of Reuben, and ye children of Gad, ye have no part in the Lord. Therefore we ſaid, Let us now prepare to build us an altar, not for burnt-offering or for ſacrifice, but that it may be a witneſs between us and you, and our generations after us, that we might do the ſervice of the Lord before him, with our burnt-offerings and with our ſacrifices, and with our peace-offerings, that your children may not ſay to our children, in time to come, "Ye have no part in the Lord." This altar was manifeſtly ſet up as a token of their being the people of God (though they lived too remote to offer up their prayers before the tabernacle) as well as thoſe who ſerved God there. And this altar we read (ver. 28) was a pattern of the altar of the Lord, or was made in the likeneſs of that altar, which was in the tabernacle. Now, ſince this was much approved of by all the people of Iſrael, (as we read in ver. 30, 33) and ſince the caſe of all

men, who lived at any distance from the tabernacle, must be exactly the same with this of the Reubenites and Gadites; can there be any doubt but that, in *their* houses of prayer, they built altars for the same end, viz. to testify, that though they lived too remote from the tabernacle to serve God constantly there, yet that the altar (Josh. xxii. 34) might be עד, wed, *a witness*, that *the Lord was their God.* It is plain, from Hosea iii. 4, that there was an altar, or pillar of memorial, of this kind, in their houses of prayer; tho' the word there, as it will be shewn hereafter, is falsely translated *image.* Is it not plain, that when the children of Israel, in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, had almost totally thrown off their allegiance from the God of heaven, that they testified this their rebellion from God, by *throwing down these altars of memorial* through the land? *The children of Israel*, says Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 10, *have forsaken thy covenant*, thrown down thy altars, *and slain thy prophets with the sword.* We have proved, therefore, that they had altars too in their houses of prayer; and if they had, then it is not to be doubted, but that they had

had ſome repreſentations of the cherubim too by the ſides, or one on each ſide of the altar, together with a laver, candleſtick, &c. and in their ephod a teraphim made in imitation of the urim of the high-prieſt; ſince in this deſcription of Micah's furniture, the ephod and teraphim are eternally joined together, as things connected with each other.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

Elohim often ſignifies one God in the ſingular.

THAT Elohim is often put for God only in the ſingular, is ſo well known to every man the leaſt converſant in the Hebrew language, that it is needleſs to cite paſſages. We may only note an error in Gen. iii. 5. where the ſerpent's words are tranſlated thus: *For God* (Elohim) *doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes ſhall be opened, and ye ſhall be as Gods* (Elohim) *knowing good and evil.* Here, in the laſt part of the verſe as well as in the former, Elohim ſhould, without doubt, have been tranſlated by *God* in the ſingular. Eve's notions yet muſt have been very plain and ſimple. She had an high idea of God, we may well imagine, from the majeſty of the voice deſcribed

to

to her by *Adam.* But it is very ridiculous to think that ſhe had any conception of other ſpiritual beings beſides him. The ſerpent knew that ſhe had a lofty opinion of the majeſty of God (Elohim); he tells her, therefore, that by eating ſhe ſhould become like *God,* and increaſe in the knowledge of good and evil. This alteration adds a grandeur to the expreſſion, and a ſtrength to the temptation.—But in the caſe of Micah, it reſtores a pious character. "To have an houſe of "God, and to have an houſe of gods," ſound very differently in our language. I would mention one other place of ſcripture, where the word Elohim, or Elohin in the Chaldean way, is turned by *Gods* inſtead of *God.* In Dan. iv. 8, Nebuchadnezzar obſerves, that *the ſpirit of the holy Gods* is in Daniel; but I think that the verſe ſhould ſtand thus: *At the laſt Daniel came in before me, whoſe name was Belteſhazzar, according to the name of my God, and in whom is the ſpirit of* THE HOLY *GOD.* Nebuchadnezzar knew, Dan. ii. 45, 47, that Daniel ſerved the great God, the GOD of gods, and the LORD of kings; and that he was inſtructed by him, who alone

was

was the Revealer of ſecrets, and therefore that in him was the ſpirit of that holy God. It may be objected, that the adjective here has a plural termination. It has indeed, but that is not ſufficient to determine the matter. It is common with this word Elohim to take a verb or adjective plural, even when the one God is meant; ſo that ſuch agreement is *according to termination*, not *according to ſenſe*. Thus Joſh. xxiv. 19, *And Joſhua ſaid unto the People, Ye cannot ſerve the Lord*; for *he is an holy* God אלהים קדשים, Elohim Chedoſim, which are the very words uſed in Daniel, allowance being made for the difference of dialects.

Some are of opinion, that the Trinity in Unity is intimated in this word; and indeed it cannot be denied, but that the Jews had ſome notion of God as a Father, of a Lord or Son of God, and of the Spirit of God; but this myſtery is more clearly aſſerted in the New Teſtament. There are indeed many places in Iſaiah, where our tranſlation adds words which are not in the original, without which additions one would think that the Trinity

Trinity was meant. Thus Isai. xliii. 11. *I, I, the Lord; and besides me no Saviour.* Ver. 15, *I, the LORD, your holy one; the Creator of Israel, your King.* Ver. 25, *I, I, He that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Elohim often signifies angels.

THAT Elohim sometimes signifies angels, we may prove thus: In Psal. lxxxvi. 8. 1 Sam. xxviii. 13. Psal. lxxxii. 6. the Hebrew bibles have Elohim, Gods, in our translation; but the Chaldee readings express it by אנגלי, angels, or מלאכיא Malachia, Angels. The LXX often also, as in Psal. xcvii. 7, and other places, turn Elohim by ἀγγελοι, *angels*. Hence Origen, in his 5th book against Celsus, rightly observes, ευρισκομεν ἀγγελους δια το θειους εἶναι καὶ θεους ἐν ταις ἱεραις πολε ὀνομαζομενους γραφαις. "We find that angels "are sometimes, on account of their divine "nature, stiled Gods in the holy scriptures." And Grotius, upon Matt. i. 20, observes, that "the Hebrews call those spirits, which "are

" are employed or ſtationed between *God*, the " Creator of the world, and men, ſometimes " Elohim Gods, and ſometimes Melachim " angels." —But this obſervation might be proved true without the uſe of learned authors, ſince God is often ſtiled God of Gods, which appellation is varied by God of Hoſts, or God of Sabaoth, Jam. v. 4, that is, God of the armies of heaven. Hence God of Gods is ſometimes the ſame as God of Angels. This was ſymbolically expreſſed by the two cherubim placed one on each ſide of the mercy-ſeat; between which cherubim, though ſuperior in height, appeared the divine light, the שְׁכִינָה Shechinah, the ἀπαυγασμα της δοξης, Heb. xiii. 3, *The ſhining forth of the glory*, or the glorious effulgence. The word Shechinah comes from the root *Shachan*, which ſignifies *to inhabit*, *to abide*, *to tabernacle*, and properly ſignifies therefore *the light reſident in the tabernacle.* In alluſion to which St. John tells us, chap. i. 14, that the *Word was made fleſh and tabernacled amongſt us*; and David, Pſ. lxxx. 1, prays thus, *Give ear, O ſhepherd of Iſrael, thou that leadeſt Joſeph like a flock, ſhine forth thou that ſit-*

teſt between the cherubim, in the old verſion of the Pſalms; *upon the cherubim*, in the new verſion; but according to the Hebrews, *irradiate the cherubim, thou that art reſident.* The *darting-upward* or *out-ſhining* of the light was not conſtant, we find by this prayer, but betokened God's favour, when the brightneſs ſtreamed forth, on any prayer which had been offered up. At ſuch times then it ſhone bright upon the cherubim, ſo as in a manner to illuminate them and the temple. That the glory of God appeared ſuperior * to the cherubim, we may ſee in Ezek. x. 18, 19, and xi. 22, where *the glory of the God of Iſrael* is always repreſented as *over the cherubim above*; and in Exod. xxv. 22, where God promiſes Moſes to commune with him *from-*

* As the ſtation of the light is not in general rightly conceived, I may be well allowed to confirm my aſſertion, that it appeared higher than the cherubim, though between them, by a citation from Philo Judæus, in his book *De Profugis*; where, when he has told us, that the winged cherubim placed by the mercy-ſeat were characteriſtical of GOD's creative and kingly power, he adds, ὁ δε ὑπερανω τουτων λογος θειος εις ορατην ουκ ἠλθεν ἰδεαν, ἁτε μηδενι των κατ' αἰσθησιν ἐμφερης ὡν, ἀλλ' αὐτος εἰκων ὑπαρχων θεου.—But the Divine WORD, who is *ſuperior* to thoſe cherubim, does not fall under any viſible ſhape, as being like to no ſenſible thing whatever, but is himſelf the image of God.

above

above the mercy-ſeat, from-between the two cherubim. Since then *to pray to God that he would ſhew the light of his countenance*, in the Jewiſh idiom of ſpeech, is to pray that *he would favour and proſper the man*; or as this ſhining forth between the cherubim, ſo as to illuminate the temple, was a token of the Divine favour among the Jews; and as the appearance of the bright light upon their ſacrifices was the ſame good omen from the creation of Adam to the erecting of the tabernacle amongſt all the patriarchs; we may ſafely thence deduce the opinion of the heathens, that the fire of a ſacrifice *blazing upward ſtrongly* was a good omen.

Ter liquido ardentem perfudit nectare Veſtam,
Ter flamma ad ſummum tecti ſubjecta reluxit:
Omine quo firmans animum, ſic incipit ipſa.
VIRG. Geor. iv. 385.

Of pureſt nectar thrice the ſea-green dame
Libations pour'd upon the ſacred flame.
The ſacred flame thrice blaz'd, and born aloof,
With ſpringing light illumin'd all the roof.

An happy omen! whence she thus began
With chearful heart.

—— *Et, amici numinis omen,*
Flamma ter accensa est, apicemque per aëra dixit.
Ov. Met. x. 278.

The flame——a sign that God had heard their pray'r,
Thrice blaz'd aloft, and mounted thro' the air.

CHAP. XXII.

Jews imagined real angels to be preſent in churches.

THE Jews not only had their cherubim in their tabernacle and afterwards the temple, and teraphim or little images of angels in their holy houſes, but they imagined that real angels were converſant in an houſe of God, as good genii appointed by God to inſpect or aſſiſt the worſhippers. Not only the Gentile word in general, but Jews alſo, allotted to every man his guardian angel. Neither is this opinion blameable, while the praiſe of his tender loving-kindneſs is attributed to God alone. Hence David, or the Pſalmiſt, in his cxxxviiith Pſalm, deſcribing the public worſhip of God, ſays, *I will give thanks unto thee, O LORD,*

with my whole heart; *even before the Gods*, the Elohim or angels, *will I ſing praiſe unto thee.* In conformity to this opinion, the angels are ſaid to be *miniſtring ſpirits ſent forth to miniſter to them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation*, Heb. i. 14. Hence the angels of little children are ſaid by Our Saviour to ſee the face of God in heaven. Hence the diſciples, at the houſe of Mary the mother of John, imagined that Peter's angel, not Peter himſelf, ſtood before the gate; and hence St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 10. exhorts women *to have a veil over their heads in churches*, to behave with the greateſt modeſty and decency in ſuch places, *becauſe of the angels*, in reverence to thoſe ſuperior beings, who, though inviſible, yet ſaw their deportment.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Many prohibitions in Scripture to be underſtood with an exception, eſpecially thoſe which concern Images and Pillars.

IT remains now to take a ſhort view of Micah's worſhip; and in order to this we muſt lay down, by way of preliminary, that many prohibitions of Scripture have an exception always implied, which bounds their force. Thus in the ſecond commandment, Exod. xx. 4, we are forbidden *to make any graven image, or any likeneſs of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.* But theſe words muſt be underſtood to ſtand thus: *Thou ſhalt not make to thyſelf any graven image, ſo as to think it like unto God, and to worſhip it.* Otherwiſe it was lawful to make

graven images, and to set them up even in the place of divine worship, while they were considered as ornaments only. This appears from hence, because God himself ordered cherubim to be made, and to be set up by the mercy-seat in the tabernacle; and, in the temple afterwards, the figures of cherubim were set up, as well as the figures of oxen under the brazen-sea.——We are forbidden, indeed, to make any graven image in order to worship it, Lev. xxvi. 1. But men have set up in houses of prayer images and representations of angels, or other images, for ornaments and decoration.

In this manner it was lawful or unlawful to have teraphim in a man's house, according to the use for which they were designed. For ornaments they were lawful, for worship unlawful. The teraphim were images of some order of good angels, or of some heathen deity. *Est enim* (says Grotius) *vox media ad bonas malasq; imagines pertinens.* "It is a common word applicable to lawful and unlawful images." Hence he translates the word by μορφωματα, *shaped things*; and Josephus by τυποι των θεων, *figures of gods*. In houses

houſes of prayer we may well allow that they were images of the good kind, and either copies from the cherubim in the tabernacle, as Grotius, in this place of Micah, will have them, or forms of the Urim to be put in the linen ephod.——The cherubim in the temple, Ezek. xli. 18, 19, had two faces, one on each ſide of their head; the face of a man on one ſide, and the face of a lion on the other. And if the teraphim of the good kind were like the cherubim, it appears likely that the image (in the original the teraphim) which Michal put in the bed, 1 Sam. xix. 13, inſtead of David, was of this kind; for though the face was covered with a cloth, yet the form of an human face probably was viſible. David himſelf, indeed, would not have ſuffered an unlawful image to be kept in his houſe, if it came to his knowledge. The teraphim, which Rachel ſtole, Gen. xxxi. 19, from Laban, on the contrary, were doubtleſs of the bad kind, little ſtarry images of the Syrian gods. This diſtinction is worthy to be noted, in order to underſtand thoſe places of Scripture

where

where they are mentioned, at leaſt in the original. In this account of Micah's houſe of prayer, and in Hoſea iii. 4, they are moſt probably of the good kind; but in Zech. x. 2, and in Ezek. xxi. 21, they are certainly of the bad kind.

Theſe obſervations may be extended alſo to *pillars*, στηλαι, which are forbidden to be ſet up, Deut. xvi. 21, *Thou ſhalt not plant thee a grove*, viz. every tree, *near unto the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou ſhalt make thee. Neither ſhalt thou ſet thee up any image* (rather pillar), *which the Lord thy God hateth.* The cuſtom of planting groves in houſes of prayer has been already conſidered; and we ſhall now ſhew that thoſe laſt words are to be underſtood as if expreſſed thus, *Neither ſhalt thou ſet thee up any pillar*, "ſo as to make it ſubſervient to idolatry." This latter clauſe is implied in theſe words, *which the Lord thy God hateth.* The word here tranſlated *image*, is, in the original, מצבה, Matztzebah, which, throughout the whole Bible, ſignifies a *pillar*, often that pillar on which the idol was placed; whence, in a large figurative

ſenſe,

ſenſe, our tranſlation too often turns it by the image itſelf placed on it. This word properly ſignifies a *pillar*; and as pillars were ſometimes ordered by God to be ſet up in commemoration of his own great works, Exod. xxxiv. 4; which pillars are expreſſed by the ſame word in the original; it is plain, to a demonſtration, that pillars too are lawful or unlawful, according to the uſe to which they are applied. All commands of this kind therefore take the form of prohibition, in Levit. xxvi. 1, *Ye ſhall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a pillar; neither ſhall ye ſet up any image of ſtone in your land, to bow down unto it, for I am the Lord.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Micah's Graven Thing probably an Altar, and his Molten Thing a Laver, Candleſtick, or ſomething of that kind.

THE graven image and molten image of Micah I have turned into *graven thing* and *molten thing*. The other part of the furniture of his houſe of prayer has been fully proved to be lawful; and could this be cleared up, every difficulty would ceaſe, and this hoſpitable man be freed from the charge of idolatry. In order to this we may firſt cite the words of Grotius on this place. *Sculptitia et fictilia erant altaria, candelabrum, aliaq; ejuſmodi minuta, vice magnorum, quæ erant in ſanctuario.* " *His carved thing and*

and molten thing were an altar, candleſtick, and other things of that kind of leſſer ſort, inſtead of the large ones which were in the tabernacle. If it is obſerved, that the Hebrew word for *altar* is מזבח, Miſebbeach, or, in Chaldaick, מדבחא, Madabbecha, neither of which words are here uſed, but inſtead of them מסל, Peſel, which properly ſignifies a *graven thing*, and often an *image*; and מסכה, Maſſecah, which ſometimes ſignifies a *molten image*; it muſt be allowed: but then it muſt be allowed too, that many words of the Hebrew language have a greater extenſion, as well as variety, than lexicons diſcover. *Illud prætermittendum non eſt*, ſays Montanus, *ſacram Scripturam adeò uberem et fœcundam eſſe, ut ſæpius duplicem ſenſum in ſe contineat.* "*We muſt obſerve that the holy tongue is ſo copious and extenſive, that it very often contains a double meaning in it.*" Hence we are often obliged to the LXX interpreters for the meaning of a word, which peculiar meaning we cannot find elſewhere. Happy ſhould I be if Grotius had proved his interpretation; but Grotius has left his explication unſupported by any

authority but his own, and truth here is thickly clouded by remote antiquity. Conjecture, however, is left free to all, and humanity teaches benevolence towards every man.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

To ſet up an Altar the ſame as to conſtitute Divine Worſhip. God's Preſence firſt fixt the Place of Altars.

AMONG the Jews, *to ſet up*, or *to build, an altar*, expreſſed the ſame ſenſe as *to conſtitute divine worſhip.* Altars, we may obſerve, were firſt erected on that ſpot of ground wherever God appeared. It was a ſtrong opinion, both of the Jews and Gentiles, that the appearance of the Deity ſanctified the place where his glory was ſeen; and therefore in ſuch places they built altars, and came to worſhip.—— To trace this truth from its original we may note, that there is the greateſt probability that God taught Adam to build an altar, and to ſacrifice to him; that Cain and Abel offered on

that

that altar; that other altars were built as men increaſed; and ſacrifices continued by the worſhippers of God, in their different ſettlements, to the time of the general deluge, when the worſhip of the true God was probably confined to a very few, though Scripture is not expreſs in thoſe points. After the deluge in Gen. viii. 20, we read of the firſt altar; and there it plainly appears (ſince Noah built it without the leaſt command or inſtruction of God about it) that it had been cuſtomary before the flood to offer ſacrifices on altars; for how elſe, without any order from God, ſhould it at once come into his mind to build an altar at that time?——That God's preſence ſanctified the place, we may ſee in Gen. ix. 1, becauſe God is there preſent to bleſs Noah and his family.—But this truth appears more evident from Gen. xii. 6, 7, where we read that *Abraham came to Sychem*, unto the oak-grove (for ſo the words might be tranſlated, as it will appear by and bye, inſtead of *unto the plain of Moreh*). *And the LORD appeared unto Abraham, and ſaid, Unto thy ſeed will I give this land*; *and*

and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him. God appears at this place; and for that reaſon Abraham builds this altar in this oak-grove in Sychem, and conſtitutes, by that means, a place of divine worſhip. *There builded he an altar* is the ſame as *There conſtituted he divine worſhip.* In the next verſe he builds another on a mountain on the eaſt of Bethel, that is, he conſtitutes another place of divine worſhip; and here God ſeems to appear to him, ver. 14. His third place of divine worſhip, or his altar, was in the *oak-grove* of Mamre, again tranſlated the *plain*, Gen. xiii. 18. Thus Abraham built three altars, which are recorded, in an oak-grove near Sychem, on an high hill near Bethel, and in an oak-grove near Mamre, in which laſt place God is alſo ſaid to appear to Abraham, Gen. xviii. 1.—The next altar of note that we meet with, is built by Iſaac, Gen. xxvi. 24, 25, at Beerſheba, where it is alſo mentioned that God *appeared to him.* Jacob alſo, Gen. xxxv. 7, builds an altar near Bethel, becauſe God there appeared. For the ſame reaſon, becauſe God appeared to Moſes at Horeb, Ex. iii. 5, and had there-

by ſanctified the ground; Moſes, Ex. xvi. 6, 15, built there an altar. Gideon, Judg. vi. 24, built alſo an altar, where the angel of the LORD's hoſt appeared.

That theſe places were conſidered as ſet apart for divine worſhip where an altar had been erected, we ſhall ſee in Gen. xxviii. 13, and following verſes. We read there, that Jacob going to Padan-aram lay down and ſlept on the place where Abraham had built one of his altars near Bethel; whoſe ſtones being fallen down, he took them for a pillow. Here God appears to him in a dream, and informs him, that he was the God of Abraham his father. Jacob being awoke reflects at once, that this place muſt have been conſecrated; that it was therefore viſited by the preſence of God, and appropriated to his worſhip. *Jacob awaked out of his ſleep, and ſaid, Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and ſaid, How dreadful is this place! This is none other but an Houſe of God, and this is the gate of Heaven.* He therefore took the ſtone, probably the ſhaft of the former altar, and ſet it up for a pillar, or

יהוה, to consecrate it again for an altar, and then vows that on his safe return to that place the Lord should be his God. *And this stone*, says he, *which I have set up for a pillar shall be* GOD's house; *and of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee.* Nothing surely can be fuller and plainer than that an altar or consecrated pillar was considered as a place of divine worship, and that Jacob here vowed tithes to the support of that worship. These tithes were not commanded by a ceremonial law, since the law of Moses had not yet its being; nor is it likely that they were fixt by any human law; since it is almost certain, that the laws at this time were only commands of God delivered down from father to son by oral tradition; and the payment of tithes to religious houses has not the least obscure stamp of any human invention. It claims to itself therefore a place among these precepts, not recorded indeed in Scripture, but given by GOD by chance to Adam, and thence handed down from generation to generation, and in all probability of the same antiquity as altars or places of worship, viz. almost co-eval with the

world. We may reaſonably, at leaſt, think it the ordinance of God; and ſince it was ordained before any of the ceremonies of the law took place, the ordinance of it muſt be of the moral kind, that is, of that ſort which is always obligatory; and the perpetual obligation to the payment of tithes is from this place as eaſily proved, as the perpetual obligation to keep the Sabbath-day can be ſhewn from any other text of Scripture; though that obligation has been clearly and evidently demonſtrated by many able writers. According to this vow Jacob is ordered, Gen. xxxv. 1, to build an altar *at* Bethel, or *nigh* Bethel, rather in that place; and then God there appears to him, and Jacob erects his pillar or צִיּוּן, ver. 14, which he conſecrates for an altar, or place of divine worſhip, by pouring a drink-offering and oil upon it. Thus it is plain, that to ſet up an altar is to fix an houſe of God, or to conſtitute divine worſhip. *This ſtone*, ſays Jacob, *ſhall be God's houſe*, i. e. a place of divine worſhip. Hence it is that we find poſterity ſtill frequenting the place where an altar had been erected. Thus Jacob, Gen. xlvi. 1, offers a ſacrifice on the altar

altar erected by his father Iſaac at Beerſheba. We have traced then this Hebrew idiom, and find that *to erect or ſet up an altar* is the ſame expreſſion as to *conſtitute divine worſhip.* Now, ſince theſe Danites under our particular conſideration manifeſtly deſigned to ordain divine worſhip, it is one reaſon to turn ver. 30, 31, of the xviiith chapter of Judges thus: *And the children of Dan ſet up the altar,* &c. *And they ſet up Micah's altar which he made, all the time that the houſe of God was in Shiloh.*

CHAP. XXVI.

Altars erected originally in groves or on hills.

ALTARS were firſt erected in groves or on high hills. Noah's altar was doubtleſs built on the mountain where the ark reſted. Abraham is ſaid to build his altar when he went unto the place of Sychem, Gen. xii. 6, 7, *unto the plain of Moreh* in our tranſlation, ἐπι την δρυν την ὑψηλην in the Greek verſion, *unto the high oak-grove*; for the word δρυς ſhould not here be tranſlated by *oak*, but *oak-grove*; though one tree in particular, under which the altar ſtood, is ſignalized by it. We have obſerved before, that the word *Moreh* in one ſenſe ſignifies properly *viſion*, and that God appeared to Abraham in that place, which probably was a large oak-grove. But I cannot but give my vote here for the Greek tranſla-

tranſlation, ſince Moreh ſignifies *high*, as it is deduced from the verb מרא, Mara, *to raiſe up or to erect*. Hence the word *Moreh* high, and *Moriah* hilly or mountainous, in Gen. xxii. 2, (for the land of Moriah is the Hill-country of Judea, as it was called) may be derived. From this verb, in Job xxxix. 18, we read of the oſtrich, that *ſhe will lift herſelf up on high, ſeſe elevaverit*, in the original תמריא *Tamria*, which is the future tenſe of the conjugation Hiphil, directly deduced from that verb. The word אֵלוֹן Ælon, ſignifies both a *plain* and an oak-grove; and as the firſt places of worſhip were fixt amidſt the awefulneſs of groves, which were therefore condemned when converted to idolatrous purpoſes; and as theſe groves were generally planted with oaks, whence

Habitæ Graiis oracula quercus. VIRG.

" Oaks were accounted oracular by the Greeks;"

the reaſon of the thing requires, that altars ſhould be here ſet up in oak-groves or under

oaks, but not in the midſt of a plain. In Judg. ix. 6, we read that the men of Shechem proclaimed Abimelech at the oak-grove *of the pillar*, or by the pillar, or altar rather, erected there: hence Jotham aſſumes his apologue or fable of the trees from the place itſelf. Hence Gaal ſaw people come along by the oak grove, ver. 37, according to Arias Montanus, of Meonenim; and Abimelech, ver. 48, cut down his boughs. Hence Jacob is ſaid to hide away the ear-rings and falſe deities of his family and attendants, Gen. xxxv. 4, under this oak-grove, which was by Shechem.—The correction then is fully proved. —Abraham again, Gen. xiii. and xiv. 13, is ſaid to dwell in the oak-grove of Mamre, and to build there an altar unto the Lord. On which altar under the tree, Gen. xviii. 8, Abraham ſerved up his meat to the Lord, who there appeared unto him. We may obſerve alſo from Deut. xi. 30, that Gilgal was by high oak-groves, not by the plains of Moreh; for if the plain of Moreh was by Shechem, we cannot well ſuppoſe it to be by Gilgal too.

To ſhew farther this falſe tranſlation, and that the firſt altars were often in oak-groves, *not in a plain*, we may note from Gen. xxv. 3, that Jacob built an altar nigh Bethel, and ver. 8, buried Deborah beneath Bethel under the oak-grove. Gideon, Judg. vi. 11, ſees an angel under an oak, or in an oak-grove, and offers him up meat on an old altar or rock that was there, ver. 20, *under the* oak; and Joſhua, Joſh. xxiv. 26, ſet up a pillar or στηλη in the famous oak-grove at Shechem. This cuſtom we find Iſ. i. 29. Ezek. vi. 13. Hoſ. iv. 13. introduced idolatry; and ſo groves for that bad purpoſe were forbidden. Indeed the native gloomineſs of thoſe places made weak people very viſionary and fantaſtical. Hence Virgil adds, in his deſcription of the Capitol, or the temple of Jupiter at Rome, which was in his time like gold, but in ancient times aweful with woody thickets,

Jam tum relligio pavidos terrebat agreſtes
Dira loci; jam tum ſylvam ſaxumq; tremebant,
Hoc nemus, hunc, inquit, frondoſo vertice collem
(Quis deus incertum eſt) habitat Deus. Arcades ipſum
Credunt ſe vidiſſe Jovem, cum ſæpe nigrantem
Ægida concuteret dextrâ, nimboſque cieret.

The gloomy grove and mountain's ſullen
height
Did then the tim'rous ruſtic herd affright.
Struck with religious awe, Some God, *ſays he*,
Frequents—(though doubtful who that God
may be)—
This woody-topped hill, this deep'ning grove.
Arcadians think t' have ſeen majeſtic Jove;
When oft' his dark'ning ægis ſhakes the ſky,
And clouds tempeſtuous o'er the welkin fly.

CHAP

CHAP. XXVII.

Pillars for what purpoſe and when lawful.

PILLARS and columns were ſet up for three purpoſes which were lawful. Firſt, they were erected as a ſtanding monument of ſome agreement which had been made between two great men or ſtates, or in memorial of ſome public order of the ſtate. An inſtance of this cuſtom we have in Gen. xxxi. 41, 51, 52, between Laban and Jacob. Articles of peace in nations were engraved upon στηλαι or pillars, and theſe public memorials ſometimes kept in their temples. Thus Iſocrates, in his panegyric mentioning the contract made between the Perſian emperor and the Athenian ſtate, adds, και ταυτας [συνθηκας] συνηναγκασεν ἡμας ἐν στηλαις λιθιναις ἀναγραψαντας ἐν τοις κοινοις των ἱερων ἀναθειναι, *And he compelled us,*

us to engrave these contracts on pillars of stone, and to set them up in the public temples. Thus when the Athenian people obliged the priests, the Eumolpidæ, to devote Alcibiades by curses; that the monument of the curse might be more public, a copy of it was cut *in a stone pillar* *, *in pilâ lapideâ*, says Cornelius Nepos, which was erected in a public place. Secondly, these pillars were set up as a memorial of some memorable person. Thus Absalom in his life-time, 2 Sam. xviii. 18, had reared up for himself a pillar of this kind to keep his name in remembrance, and doubtless designed to be buried under it, for these pillars were generally erected on the graves. Thus Gen. xxxv. 20, *Jacob set up a pillar upon Rachel's grave, that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day.* A pillar of this kind was without doubt the stone of Bohan the son of Reuben, mentioned Josh. xv. 6; and the stone of Abel, mentioned 1 Sam. vi. 18; and other remarkable stones mentioned throughout the Scriptures, as in 1 Kings i. 9, and 2 Sam. xx.

* Hence στηλιτευω signifies to publish, by engravings in pillars, the crimes of any convict. This was the first method of punishing by pillory.

8. These

8. Theſe pillars on graves probably were firſt plain, but were very early engraved with the actions of the deceaſed, whom blind poſterity not only admired but worſhipped: and hence theſe pillars became the cauſes of idolatry. Hence Peſel, which properly ſignifies an *engraved ſtone*, came alſo to ſignify a *graven image*, from the images afterwards placed on theſe engraved pillars. In latter times we find that they alſo adorned thoſe pillars with elegant figures. Thus Simon, 1 Maccab. xiii. 27, *built a monument upon the ſepulchre of his father and brethren, and raiſed it aloft to the ſight with hewn ſtone behind and before. Moreover he ſet up ſeven pyramids one againſt another for his father and his mother and his four brethren*; *and in theſe he made cunning devices, about the which he ſet great pillars, and upon the pillars he made all their armour for a perpetual memory, and by the armour ſhips carved, that they might be ſeen of all that ſail on the ſea.* And in 1 Mac. xiv. 27, we have a full account of the inſcription of Simon's atchievments on a pillar of this kind. Theſe pillars were inſcribed with the name, and family, and actions of the buried perſon after the early times, and were

conſi-

conſidered as very honorary. Hence Juno, in Homer, Iliad xvi. comforts Jupiter on the enſuing death of his ſon Sarpedon, by enumerating this honour among the reſt to be conferred upon him.

Ἔνθα ἑ ταρχύσουσι καὶ σήμα τε, ἠδὲ στήλη τε·
Τύμβῳ τε, στήλῃ τε· τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ γερόντων.

His friends and people to his future praiſe
A marble tomb and pyramid ſhall raiſe,
And laſting honours to his aſhes give:
His fame ('tis all the dead can have) ſhall live.

Thirdly, theſe pillars were erected in order to eternize the memory of ſome great favour or wonderful work of God, and ſo were uſed for altars. Thus Gen. xxxv. 13, 14, God vouchſafes Jacob a gracious appearance; and then *Jacob ſet up a pillar in the place where God talked with him, even a pillar of ſtone; and he poured a drink-offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon.* Moſes, Exod. xvii. 15, 16, builds an altar of this kind (for theſe pillars being uſed as altars take often the name of altars) inſcribed, ſays Joſephus, after his conqueſt

conqueſt over the Amalechites, TO GOD THE CONQUEROR, and for a memorial that God would utterly deſtroy Amalek; and, Exod. xxiv. 4, twelve pillars near Mount Sinai are raiſed to keep in perpetual remembrance God's delivery of the law there; and Samuel, 1 Sam. vii. 12, ſet up a ſtone to betoken the place, to which God had aſſiſted them. I ſhall add to the inſtances already produced but one more in this place, taken out of Joſhua, chap. iv. where we read that *twelve men, choſen out of every tribe a man,* verſe 3, were to take on their ſhoulders twelve large ſtones out of the river Jordan, to be erected as a memorial of that wonderful work of God, when Jordan fled back before his preſence to give a dry paſſage to the Iſraelites. Theſe ſtones were ſet up in Gilgal, and were manifeſtly, therefore, twelve pillars, and, in all probability, engraven with the deſcription of that wonderful action; which is almoſt intimated verſe 7, ſince they were *to be a memorial to the children of Iſrael for ever,* and ſince Joſhua, chap. viii. 32, was inſtructed to carve in ſtones in great

perfection; which art of carving was, in my opinion, derived, through Noah, from the ante-diluvian race of men, who, doubtleſs, in two thouſand years, had learnt many curious arts, and in particular the neceſſary one of leaving their tranſactions in ſome method of record.—Theſe ſtones or pillars, therefore, near Gilgal muſt be very remarkable; and ſince Peſel ſignifies any carved or graven thing, are doubtleſs meant by Peſilim in Judg. iii. 19, 26, which the Greek verſion expreſſes by τα γλυπτα, *carved things*, whether images or pillars, but our tranſlation by quarries. On theſe pillars they ſeem to offer ſacrifice, 1 Sam. xi. 15, and xiii. 8, 9, ſince we read of no other altar erected for that purpoſe; and thoſe pillars were, as it has been proved, ſometimes converted to that uſe, on extraordinary occaſions, by a prophet of the Lord. Here then we have found that *Peſel* may ſignify a carved pillar or altar, as well as a carved image. Now ſince the good Micah manifeſtly ſerved the true God, and had a regular prieſt, after the law of Moſes, to perform divine ſervice; yea, a prieſt who ſeems to be a grandſon of Mo-

ſes; ſince alſo the word *Peſel* will bear the ſignification of *pillar* or *altar*; and ſince altars in houſes of prayer have been proved to be only pillars of memorial; it is ſurely agreeable to the character of the man to affirm with Grotius, that his carved thing was an altar, with ſome inſcription carved on it, ſhewing the dedication of the worſhippers to the true God. If this is allowed, there will remain no difficulty in the word which ſignifies or is explained by *molten image*, ſince it is a common word ſignifying *fuſion*, and every thing made by fuſion, be it image or veſſel.

CHAP. XXVIII.

A Pillar of this kind their Altar in Houſes of Prayer.

A Pillar of this kind was conſidered as their altar in houſes of prayer. This will appear from the third chapter of the prophet Hoſea. *Then ſaid the Lord unto me, Go, yet love a woman (beloved of her friend, yet an adultereſs) according to the love of the Lord towards the children of Iſrael, who look to other gods, and love flagons of wine. So I bought her to me for fifteen pieces of ſilver, and for an homer of barley, and for an half homer of barley. And I ſaid unto her, Thou ſhalt abide for me many days; thou ſhalt not play the harlot, and thou ſhalt not be for another man; ſo will I alſo be for thee. For the children of Iſrael ſhall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a ſacrifice, and without* a pillar or altar, *and without an ephod, and without*

out teraphim. If we keep our eye ſteady on the allegory of this chapter, and explain it by a ſimilar place in Iſaiah lvii. 6, 7, 8, we ſhall find that God is the huſband; the houſe of Iſrael the wife, who had acted the adultereſs by going after other gods; that God ſtill was willing to take his wife into favour; but, in order to prove her future chaſtity, that he would abſent himſelf a while. This abſence the prophet deſcribes in the 4th verſe. *For the children of Iſrael ſhall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a ſacrifice, and without an altar,* or מצבה, *and without an ephod, and without teraphim;* that is, without civil and eccleſiaſtical government, and without divine ſervice in any houſe of prayer. — The abſence of God is ſurely here deſcribed in the ſtrongeſt and fulleſt terms. The children of Iſrael would have no king, nor their princes, viz. the ſanhedrim, the ſupreme council of the ſeventy chiefs, the moſt powerful aſſembly that ever ſat in judgment in any ſtate, made up of the rulers and princes of every tribe. They could cite even a king before them, ſay the Talmudiſts. Joſephus records, that

they called Herod before them for putting a notorious robber to death without their ſentence. Indeed, we may ſee in Jer. xxxviii. 5, that their king without their ſuffrage had a very confined power in capital affairs; and ſome think, that if David could have protected himſelf and Bathſheba from their power, he would never have ſigned the death-warrant of Uriah. —— The Iſraelites wanting a king and theſe princes, muſt want civil government; and ſince they were to be without a ſacrifice, they would be deprived of their temple-worſhip. Nor was their unhappineſs in being left by God to ſtop here. Even the houſes of prayer were to be ſhut up; they muſt want too their pillar, ephod, and teraphim. The word Matztzebah in this place is ſtrangely turned by *ſtatue*, whoſe only proper ſignification, as I have before obſerved, is that of a *pillar*, or στηλη, which in a good ſenſe ſignifies an *altar*, and is accordingly in this place rightly turned by θυσιαστηριον, *altar*, in the Greek verſion. It is ſurprizing that this good ſenſe of the word ſhould not be obſerved by any Hebrew Lexicon; eſpecially when theſe pillars, unleſs deſigned for

for idolatrous uſes, were lawful, and erected for God's honour. Thus Iſ. xix. 19, 20, *In that day ſhall there be an altar unto the Lord in the midſt of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the* LORD. *And it ſhall be for a ſign, and for a witneſs unto the Lord in the Land of Egypt.* Had Grotius conſidered this, he would not have paraphraſed theſe words of the prophet Hoſea thus: "The children "of Iſrael ſhall be without any worſhip, "either true or falſe." For, though it is a great unhappineſs, indeed, for a nation to be without a true religion, yet ſurely it cannot be ſo to be without a falſe one. But this place of the prophet will be now much clearer, when this pillar, ephod and teraphim have been proved to be furniture in their houſes of prayer. Thus in the prophet Hoſea we ſee Micah's furniture to be that which was uſual in houſes of God. Since therefore, in houſes of prayer, there was a pillar or little memorial-altar, in imitation of the great one in the ſanctuary; and ſince the word Peſel, in its largeſt extent, may ſignify ſuch a pillar; ſurely my tranſlation, which turns the word by *carved thing*,

will be juſtified, if not Micah's character vindicated. Since alſo in houſes of prayer theſe pillars have been proved to be ſymbols of the worſhippers being in allegiance with the God of heaven, and, in all probability, marked with ſome inſcriptions; why may not St. Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 19, be thought to refer to thoſe inſcribed monuments betwixt God and his true worſhippers, when he tells us, that the *foundation*, or memorial-ſtone, *of God ſtandeth ſure, having this ſeal*, or engraving on it, *The Lord knoweth who are his;* and, on the other ſide of the ſtone, *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt, depart from iniquity.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIX.

Many abſurd Tranſlations in Scripture by turning Names proper into appellative.

AS the Hebrews have no diſtinction of letters into great and ſmall, it is ſometimes difficult to diſtinguiſh a proper name of a *man*, or *place*, or falſe deity, when the name alſo is common to ſome other things; eſpecially if we diſregard the Hebrew vowels, as the tranſlators of our Bible manifeſtly did. *Moloch* or *Molech*, or *Melech*, is the name of a falſe deity, and alſo ſignifies a *king*. I ſhall ſubmit it to the judgment of learned men, whether the word *Moloch*, in Iſ. lvii. 9, ſhould not be put inſtead of *king*. The prophet is certainly complaining of his unworthy countrymen, who turned to the worſhip of idols, and, ver. 5, who ſacrificed their children to ſome grim deity. But this dreadful devil,

who is deſcribed as chiefly delighted with human ſacrifices, is Moloch :

Moloch, horrid king beſmear'd with blood
Of human ſacrifice, and parents tears;
Tho' for the noiſe of drums and timbrels loud
Their children's cries unheard, that paſt thro' fire
To his grim idol. MILT. *Par. loſt.* B. 1. L. 395.

It is ſurely more agreeable to the context, and more eaſy to be underſtood, if we read that place of the prophet thus: *And thou wenteſt to Moloch*, viz. to his worſhip, *with ointment, and didſt increaſe thy perfumes, and thou ſenteſt thy meſſengers afar off*, viz. to bring home other ſtrange gods and ways of worſhip, *and didſt debaſe thyſelf even to hell.* I do not think it ſafe to alter one word in the original; but here conjecture ſeems allowable.

In this manner whereas we interpret Zech. xiv. 21, *There ſhall be no more the Canaanite in the houſe of the Lord*; the Vulgate, as the word *Canaanite* ſignifieth alſo a *merchant*, rendereth it, *non erit mercator, there ſhall not be a merchant,*

chant, very agreeably to the text, and to the completion thereof by our Bleſſed LORD, who, Matt. xxi. 13, John ii. 16, drove out the buyers and ſellers, and would not ſuffer his father's houſe to be an houſe of merchandiſe. So alſo the LXX interpreters turn *Huzzab*, Nahum ii. 7, by ὑποστασις; by which they mean the conſtitution, the internal ſupport of the ſtate of Nineveh. In theſe inſtances a proper name is falſely put down for an appellative. The Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos thus render Gen. xxxviii. 2, not the daughter of a certain *Canaanite*, but of a certain *merchant*.

In Pſ. cxli. 7, we read *Our bones lie ſcattered at the grave's mouth, as when one cutteth and cleaveth wood upon the earth;* which may be turned into "Our bones lie ſcattered *before Saul*, as when one cutteth and cleaveth wood upon the earth." The Pſalmiſt might here commemorate the dreadful ſlaughter 1 Sam. xxii. 17, 18, when Doeg, before Saul, ſlew the prieſts of the LORD, and hewed them probably in pieces with his ſword. This miſtake in a tranſlation may eaſily happen by the likeneſs

neſs to each other of שְׁאוֹל Sheol, a pit or grave, and שָׁאוּל Saul, the name of a king.

I would note alſo that 1 Kings xvii. 4, הָעֹרְבִים, the Worebim, *the ravens*, are ſaid to feed Elijah at the brook Cherith before Jordan. Now there is a town mentioned Joſh. xv. 6, called Beth-warabah, or ſimply Warabah, whoſe inhabitants would be called Worebim, or Haworebim, the men of Warabah. Hence it is probable that the tranſlation 1 Kings xvii. 4, 6, ſhould ſtand thus: *And it ſhall be, that thou ſhalt drink of the brook, and I have commanded the men of Warabah to feed thee there. And the men of Warabah brought him bread and fleſh in the morning, and bread and fleſh in the evening, and he drank of the brook.* This obſervation, which I ſuppoſe I may juſtly claim as my own, will take off one topic of ridicule from deiſtical men, and be more confirmed by noting that the town is, Joſh. xviii. 22, in the tribe of Benjamin, and ſeems not far from the river Jordan.

I may add another obſervation, though not my own, on Judg. xv. 19, and adviſe that

Lehi

Lehi ſignifies both *a jaw-bone* and a place. Sampſon threw away the jaw-bone, ver. 17, and called the place Ramath-lehi, that is, *the caſting away of the jaw-bone*; which place is called, ver. 19, ſimply Lehi. And if it is a proper name in the latter part of the verſe, why ſhould it not be in the former, and the verſe ſtand thus? *But God clave an hollow place, which was in Lehi, and there came water thereout. And when he had drank, his ſpirit came again, and he revived; wherefore he called the name thereof Enhakkore, which is in Lehi unto this day.* Sampſon called the well which ſprung forth Enhakkore, viz. *the well of him that called*; and that well is in Lehi unto this day. It is in Lehi, not in the jaw-bone of the aſs, and therefore from ſome pit in Lehi muſt it firſt ſpring.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXX.

The Iſraelites had many of them a mixed worſhip.

TO reviſe the Jewiſh church in its firſt ſettlements we muſt conſider, that many of the Jews mixt the worſhip of the Egyptian and Syrian gods with the worſhip of the true God. Terah, the father of Abraham, and Nahor his brother, Joſh. xxiv. 2, appear to be worſhippers of Syrian gods, and Rachel ſeems too much touched with the Syrian infection; ſince ſhe ſtole away and concealed her father's gods, called teraphim in the original, εἰδωλα, idols, by the LXX, and τυποι των θεων, figures of gods, by Joſephus. The word teraphim here plainly has a bad ſignification, ſince, in Gen. xxxv. 2, Jacob orders his houſhold to put away all the ſtrange gods which were amongſt them. Accordingly,

cordingly, verſe 4, *They gave unto Jacob all the ſtrange gods which were in their hand, and all their ear-rings which were in their ears, and Jacob hid them under the oak-grove which was by Sychem.* Their ear-rings, we muſt remark, were ſtamped with the ſtar of the deity which they worſhipped, and therefore ſuperſtitiouſly worn in honour of him. Grotius ſays, that their ear-rings were hence called σφραγιδες, impreſſed jewels; but, according to the Greek tranſlation of Exod. xxxv. 22, σφραγιδες, *impreſſed jewels*, were *bracelets ſtamped*; though, doubtleſs, their ἐνωτια, *ear-rings*, were ſtamped alſo. Hence Auguſtin, in his ſeventy-third epiſtle, has theſe words: *Quid cum eis agendum ſit, ſi ſolvere in aures timent, et corpus Chriſti cum ſigno diaboli accipere non timent. What can be done with ſuch men, if they are afraid to take off their ear-rings, but fear not to receive the body of Chriſt, while they wear the mark of the devil.* Their ear-rings were worn as charms, like the ring of Gyges mentioned by Plato, to drive off evil ſpirits and diſeaſes forſooth. Joſephus tells us, that Rachel carried off her father's gods to ſecure herſelf from her father's indignation, if he ſhould

ſhould overtake them; ſo that theſe teraphim too were charms againſt future damage. Hence it is very plain that the Syrian ſuperſtition and idolatry was ſtrong in Jacob's family, though, doubtleſs, he himſelf ordered and taught them to ſerve the true GOD of heaven only; and it may be doubted whether his houſe was ever truly purged. The going of the children of Iſrael into Egypt, and their long ſtay there, renewed, I doubt, their worſhip of their ſtarry gods. Notwithſtanding they had ſeen ſuch mighty works in Egypt, and at the Red-Sea; yet at *Sin*, Exod. xv. and at Rephidim, Exod. xvi. they began to queſtion whether God was among them or not, and to ſay with their idolatrous country-women in Jer. xliv. 18, *Since we left off to burn incenſe to the queen of heaven, and poured out* (rather to pour out) *drink-offerings unto her, we have wanted all things.*—While God was commanding Moſes not to make a graven image, Exod. xx. 4, 25, nor *his ſacrificing altar* of hewn ſtone, leſt it ſhould be like the pillars of the Heathen; yea, while, Exod. xxiii. 24, he is ordering the *Iſraelites indeed* to pull down, and utterly to overthrow the gods of the

the Heathens, into whoſe land they were to come, quite to break down their pillars, or σηλαι, according to the true Greek verſion; even at that time theſe backſliders, Exod. xxxii. were with Aaron making a god in imitation of an Egyptian idol.—It appears from this, that they had not left the Egyptian idolatry behind them, but what is very notorious, carried their ſtarry gods ſtill in their *ear-rings*, ver. 2, 3, which they then collected to make their graven image. From this time they ſeem to have continued in their idolatry till they came to the Holy Land, as we may ſee in Acts vii. 41, 42, 43. *They made a calf in thoſe days, and offered ſacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. Then God turned, and gave them up to worſhip the hoſts of heaven, as it is written in the book of the Prophets, O ye houſe of Iſrael, have ye offered to me ſlain beaſts and ſacrifices for the ſpace of forty years in the wilderneſs? Yea ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the ſtar of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worſhip them.* The place here referred to by St. Stephen is that of the prophet Amos, chap. v. ver. 25, 26, with this difference only, that

that Remphan is there called Chiun. But the note of Grotius on that place of the prophet very well reconciles, as well as explains theſe paſſages; only that he erroneouſly turns, *Have ye offered unto me?* into *Have ye not offered unto me?* He would have obſerved his miſtake, if he had carefully compared the two places with the 14th verſe of the xxivth chapter of Joſhua. I ſhall tranſlate therefore the uſeful part of the note only, and leave the other part as if not appertaining to the ſubject.

1. He notes that the tabernacle or ζκηνη, in which the idol was born, was a νἀισκ©, or να© ζευγοφορημεν© a little fort of chapel or chair in which the image was incloſed, and born by a fort of yoke by two men on each ſide.

2. He notes that Moloch is the name which the Ammonites give the ſtar Saturn; that Chiun is the name of the ſame planet among the Arabians and Perſians; and that Rimmon, 2 Kings v. 18, or Remvan, or Remphan in the Greek pronunciation, is its name among the Syrians.

3. He remarks, that though the ſame planet was worſhipped, yet he was worſhipped as two gods under different names, in the ſame manner as Diana and Luna among the Romans; that in particular Moloch was habited like a king, and Chiun figured like a ſtar. When the Iſraelites were now arrived to the bounds of the holy land, and had conquered ſome enemies; yet, Numb. xxv. we ſee that they quickly fell into the worſhip of Baal amongſt the Moabites.—Indeed after the death of Moſes, during the life of Joſhua and his cotemporaries, Judg. ii. 7, the greater part of the Jewiſh nation ſeems to have adhered to the worſhip of the true God. They had the drying up of Jordan, and the great ſucceſs which God wonderfully afforded them againſt enemies ſuperior in ſtrength, before their eyes. The greater part then in this interval worſhipped the true God. I ſay the greater part; for the whole people are denominated true worſhippers or idolaters, according to the affections of the majority. We may take notice, that ſome men, in the moſt idolatrous times, ſtuck cloſe to God's true worſhip. There were always

ſome *who had not bowed the knee to Baal.* On the other hand, ſome men worſhipped images in the pureſt times of religion. Even in the days of Joſhua, Joſh. xxiv. 23, they had ſtill ſtrange gods amongſt them; and too many, therefore, mixt the worſhip of the true God with that of idols, or, in Elijah's words, *halted between two opinions.* Now, ſince Peſel does generally ſignify *a graven image* that was worſhipped, and Maſſekah often a *molten image*; it has bore hard upon Micah, as if he alſo had a mixt religion, and worſhipped the true God together with idols; but yet I could wiſh that Micah, who himſelf eſtabliſhed an houſe of prayer to worſhip the God of heaven in; who entertained regularly a Levite for his prieſt, and expected the bleſſing of Jehovah on himſelf and family, could be allowed one of thoſe, who made no other uſe of images, (ſuppoſing them to be ſuch) but only as ornaments about the houſe of prayer. —There is certainly no example, where any other Levite beſides Micah's, *whoſe ſole inheritance* was the LORD, ſhould ſo early revolt from his God and his intereſt, as to permit ſuch a mixture of worſhip where he was em-

employed. The Jewiſh writers all agree, that no Levite joined in murmuring againſt God and Moſes; no Levite joined with Aaron in making the calf; but that every prieſt of that order retained his integrity to God. Hence God, by his prophet Malachi, Mal. ii. 4, 5, 6, ſaith, *Ye ſhall know that I have ſent this commandment unto you, that my covenant might be with Levi, ſaith the Lord of hoſts. My covenant was with him of life and peace: and I gave them to him, for the fear wherewith he feared me; and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity.*—And it looks now as a flat contradiction to common ſenſe, to imagine that Micah's mother would *wholly* and *entirely dedicate money* to Jehovah, and yet make with it graven images, in order to worſhip them.

CHAP. XXXI.

The original of ſtarry Gods.

I Have mentioned the Egyptian and Syrian ſtarry gods; and as the Iſraelites (ſee Ezek. xxiii.) were chiefly drawn away after them, we may obſerve, that it was the opinion of the Egyptians, and of the other nations under the doctrine of the Zabians, that the intellectual part of the ſoul of their great heroes was advanced to a god, and made the ruling power of ſome ſtar; and that it from that ſtar ſhed down its influence upon its worſhippers. The ſoul of Iſis in particular was ſuppoſed to reign in the dog-ſtar. Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the inſcription upon her pillar was, Ἐγω ειμι ἡ ἐν τῳ Ασρῳ τῳ Κυνι ἐπιτελλουσα, *I am ſhe who ariſe in the dog-ſtar.* The Romans too, had ſtrongly imbibed

bed this opinion. *Poſt necem Julii Cæſaris*, ſays Suetonius, *ſtella crinita per ſeptem continuos dies fulſit exoriens circa undecimam horam, creditumque eſt animam eſſe Cæſaris in cœlum recepti, et hâc de cauſâ ſimulachro ejus in vertice additur ſtella.* "After the death of Julius Cæſar, a comet ſhone for ſeven continual days, ariſing about the eleventh hour; and it was believed that it was the ſoul of Cæſar received into heaven; and for this reaſon a ſtar is added to his image on his head." Virgil in his ixth eclogue 46th line mentions this new ſtar of Cæſar.

Daphni, quid antiquos ſignorum ſuſpicis ortus?
Ecce, Dionæi proceſſit Cæſaris aſtrum;
Aſtrum, quo ſegetes gauderent frugibus; et quo
Duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem.

Why ſtill conſult for ancient ſigns the ſkies?
Daphnis, behold the Julian ſtar ariſe!
Whoſe pow'r the fields with copious corn
ſhall fill,
And clothe with richer grapes each ſunny
hill. WARTON.

The ſame poet, complimenting his great patron Auguſtus with the choice of his future honours, fixes him at laſt in a ſtar.

Tuq ; adeò, quem mox quæ ſint habitura deorum
Concilia, incertum eſt, &c.

Georg. I. lin. 24.

And thou, thou chief, whoſe ſeat among the Gods
Is yet unchoſen in the bleſt abodes ;
Wilt thou, great Ceſar, o'er the earth preſide,
Protect her cities, and her empires guide ?
While the vaſt globe ſhall feel thy genial pow'r,
Thee as the god of foodful fruits adore ;
Sov'reign of ſeaſons, of the ſtorm and wind,
And with thy mother's boughs thy temples bind ?
Or over boundleſs ocean wilt thou reign,
Smooth the wild billows of the raging main ?
While utmoſt Thule ſhall thy nod obey,
To thee in ſhipwrecks ſhiv'ring ſailors pray ;
And Tethys, if ſome watery nymph ſhould pleaſe,
Would give in dowry all her thouſand ſeas.

Or

Or wilt thou mount a *new bright ſign* on high,
Betwixt the Maid and Scorpius deck the ſky?
Scorpius ev'n now his burning claws confines,
And more than a juſt ſhare of heav'n reſigns.
WARTON.

Thus the poet places Auguſtus to ſupport the ballance or Libra, which office before was aſſigned to the Scorpion, which before that time held it up with his two fore-claws extended. And as Libra was the ſign which was ſaid to preſide over Italy, the poet did his part to continue to his prince the honour of the guardian-angel of his country; and accordingly on gems and medals, on which after the death of Auguſtus the ſigns of the zodiac are impreſſed, the ballance between Virgo and Scorpius is ſeen ſupported by a man. In the ſame manner, Ovid in his Metamorphoſis deſcribes the inſtellation—— pardon the new-coined word—of Julius Cæſar.

Vix ea fatus erat, mediâ cum ſede ſenatûs
Conſtitit alma Venus, &c.

Scarce had he ended, when the Cyprian dame
Swift as wing'd thought amid the ſenate came;
Inviſible to mortal eyes there ſtood;
And from her Cæſar's corpſe defil'd with blood,
His ſpirit juſt diſlodg'd did kindly bear
Heav'nward, nor ſuffer'd to diſſolve in air.
In ambient ſky well-pleas'd ſhe could perceive
It gather light, and growing flames receive:
Then let it from her boſom ſpring;—when ſoon
It mounted up ſuperior to the moon;
And a long train of light aſcending drew;
Then ſhone a ſtar to the beholder's view.

SANDYS.

This opinion of the Egyptians is more than once mentioned by Philo Judæus their philoſopher. Ἀστέρες ζῶα εἶναι λέγονται, καὶ ζῶα νοερὰ· μᾶλλον δὲ νοῦς ἕκαστος, ὅλος δι' ὅλου σπουδαῖος καὶ παντὸς ἀνεπιδεκτικὸς κακοῦ. Phil. in Coſm. *Stars are ſaid to be creatures, and intelligent creatures; or rather each of them is itſelf an intelligence; the whole entirely good, and incapable of any evil.* Though the great archbiſhop Uſher ſeems to be of a different opinion; yet I muſt think that it is reaſonably concluded, that

that the place of the burial of Moſes, Deut. xxxi. 6, was concealed, leſt the children of Iſrael ſhould build a *pillar* over his grave, and by degrees worſhip him as ſome benign ſtar, even as the Egyptians had deified the heroes of their country, their *Indigetes Dii*, known to them by pillars of that kind.

We may remark alſo, that as the Platonic philoſophy divided the ſoul of man into two parts, viz. the ſoul properly ſpeaking, and the intelligence or νους, which they conſidered as the governing principle of the ſoul; which νους, or intelligence, they ſuppoſed to be converted into a ſtar; from which diviſion of the ſoul, or rather from which ſuper-induction of this intelligence to the ſoul, Juvenal ſays, that God gave to other creatures *animas* ſouls, but to man *animum quoque*, an *intelligence* alſo; and as they employed ſome ſouls in ſtars, or converted them into ſtars; ſo they employed others in the government of ſtates, or as the guardian angels of mankind. Old Heſiod ſo clearly and poetically deſcribes this their office for the good of mankind, that I ſhall tranſcribe his words, leſt my tranſlation ſhould fall ſhort of the original.

Αυταρ ἐπει κεν τυτο γενωϑ κατα γαια καλυψε·
Τοι μεν δαιμονες ἐισι, Διος μεγαλυ δια βυλας,
Ἐσϑλοι, ἐπιχϑονιοι, φυλακες ϑνητων ἀνϑρωπων.
Ὁι ρα φυλασσυσι δικας και ὀχετλια ἐργα
Ἠερα ἐσσαμενοι, παντη φοιτωντες ἐπ' αἰαν
Πλυτοδοται· Και τυτο γερας βασιλἠιον ἐσχον.

These heroes, when they mortals ceas'd to be,
Demons became by Jove's supreme decree;
Benign in nature, though terrestrial Gods,
Still man they friendly guard, and man's abodes.
Conceal'd from them nor crimes nor virtues lie,
Tho' cloth'd in air, conceal'd from mortal eye;
Roaming the earth with wealth they crown the just,
Their dispensation such, and such their kingly trust.

Indeed since, in order to exercise their obedience, the blessed angels, and perhaps glorified saints, are employed by God for the good of his other creation; and since there are different orders and powers among them;

I can

I can ſee nothing inconſiſtent with the honour of God, or repugnant to the cauſe of religion, though we ſhould imagine, that the difference of their power conſiſts, while one overſees and guards a good man, another a city, a third a ſtate, and another fixed in a ſtar, which is a ſun to its ſyſtem, preſides as it were over one of the creations of God. We read in St. Luke xix. 16, 17, &c. of ſome that are ſet over two cities, others over five, and others over ten; in Dan. x. 13, 20, 21, of angels who preſide over ſtates; in Rev. xix. 17, of an angel in the ſun. In Job xxxviii. 7, we read, that at God's creation *the morning ſtars ſang together, and the ſons of God ſhouted for joy;* where by *morning ſtars* are certainly underſtood angels of a very high order; ſince we read in Rev. ii. 26, 27, of this great reward given to a ſaint or martyr of perſevering virtue, that he ſhould have a morning-ſtar. *He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations* (*and he ſhall rule them with a rod of iron; as the veſſels of a potter ſhall they be broken to ſhivers*) *even as I received of my Father, and I will give him a* morning-ſtar. Thus whoever

will carefully reviſe the Scriptures, will ſee that this notion of mine is not quite owing to a ſprightly imagination; that it is not the το εἰκη προσαναπλατ̃ομενου of Longinus, the *conceit flightily framed*, but that it may be founded on certain truth.

The devil deceived mankind by counterfeiting the other ordinances of God; and it will not therefore be wonderful, if his ſubtlety perverted to idolatrous purpoſes this decree of heaven alſo.—This opinion, at leaſt, gives us a delightful proſpect of the glorious employments of the heavenly inhabitants, who are made, as St. John expreſſes it, *kings and prieſts unto God.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXII.

The worſhip of the true God under the repreſentation of an image, the common idolatry.

IT is poſſible that Micah might worſhip the true God in ſome image, but not probable; for it is ſtrange that the Levite his prieſt (whoſe office it was to explain the law and commandments to thoſe under his care, Deut. xxxi. 9, and Deut. xxxiii. 10; and whoſe ſole inheritance was the LORD GOD of Iſrael, Numb. xviii. 24. Deut. xviii. 12,) ſhould be ſo ungrateful to his ſupreme Lord, ſo blind to his own intereſt, ſo ignorant in his duty, or if not ignorant, ſo hardened in ſin, as to admit of ſuch a worſhip in an houſe, and afterwards in a tribe, where he was employed. If he did tranſgreſs in that groſs way, he could not plead ignorance, as the Levites (ſup-

(ſuppoſing that any had been concerned with Aaron in ſetting up the calf) might in ſome meaſure have done. Moſes had continued forty days in the mount; the people deſpaired of ever ſeeing him more, and deſired *a* God to go before them——*one* God, not *gods*.—In Exod. xxxii. 1, 23, we muſt turn *Up, make us gods, which may go before us*, into *Up, make us* a *God, which may go before us*;—*Theſe be thy gods, O Iſrael*, ver. 4, 8, into *This is thy God, O Iſrael*;—and *gods of gold*, ver. 31, into *a God of gold*. It was but one calf which Aaron made, and the people knew that it was but one God which brought them out of Egypt. It muſt be therefore a contradiction to common ſenſe, as well as to common ſpeech, to ſay of one calf or idol, *Theſe be thy gods*. This, by the bye, is one proof more, that Elohim may be ſingular in its ſignification, though verbs or adjectives adjoined to it are plural, which in ſuch caſe have reſpect to termination only in the agreement.

To paſs on, Aaron certainly deſigned this image for a repreſentation of the true God to the people; ſince in ver. 5, *he built an altar before*

before it, and made a proclamation and ſaid, To-morrow is a feaſt for Jehovah; for ſo the word LORD is in the original; a name throughout the Scriptures appropriated to none but the true God only. Thus *the children of Iſrael changed God their glory into the ſimilitude of an ox that eateth graſs*, Pſ. cvi. 20. Now, though Aaron was with Moſes, in all probability, Exod. xix. 24, when the ten commandments were delivered, and ſo could not be ignorant that ſuch a repreſentation of God was forbidden; yet the Levites might not then know the will of God exactly, ſince Moſes had not yet brought down the tables from the mount. ——Moſes certainly charges the cauſe of the ſin on Aaron alone, Exod. xxxii. 21, *And Moſes ſaid unto Aaron, What did this people unto thee, that thou haſt brought ſo great a ſin upon them?*— But whatever Aaron's Levites might do thro' ignorance; yet Micah's Levite muſt know both the ſin and God's indignation againſt it, in the puniſhment of it.

That the Levites, in general, had a great averſion to ſuch a groſs worſhip of God, we may ſee by reviewing the ſin of Jeroboam, the

the ſon of Nebat. This politician conſidered, that if he ſhould ſuffer the ten tribes which God had withdrawn from the houſe of David, to go up to Jeruſalem to worſhip thrice a year, Deut. xvi. 16, after the eſtabliſhed cuſtom; that his people might reflect on the good which Solomon the father of Rehoboam, *from whom they had revolted*, had conferred on the children of Iſrael; how he was honoured by God with building that glorious houſe in the place which God choſe! how they were indebted to David for their extent of empire! and what promiſes God had made to David and his ſeed! He thought that the ſight of the temple might be dangerous, and the converſation of the loyal ſubjects of David's grandſon infectious; and therefore, *in his worldly wiſdom* erected one calf in Bethel, and another in Dan, 1 Kings xii. 26; and inſinuating convenience of worſhip to his new ſubjects, proclaimed,—*Behold thy God, O Iſrael, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt.* But what prieſts had he to ſerve before thoſe pretended images of the true God? Did one of the Levites join him?—He would have accepted them, it is highly probable, if they would

would have ſubmitted to his new worſhip. The compliance of the prieſts would have given a fine colour to his innovation in religion. He certainly rejected them, becauſe they rejected his idol. Hence he was obliged, 1 Kings xii. 31, *to make prieſts of the loweſt of the people, which were not of the ſons of Levi.* The Levites and regular prieſts, 2 Chron. xiii. 10, ſtuck faſt to the true God, and left thoſe new-faſhioned prieſts and the king to the dreadful puniſhment, which, from the caſe of Aaron, they could not but think would enſue.

Thus Jeroboam eſtabliſhed the worſhip, as he pretended, of the true God under the ſhape of an image in ten tribes; and therefore is emphatically ſtiled *the man who made Iſrael to ſin.* This ſin is as great a diſhonour to God's majeſty, as it is even for a man to worſhip falſe gods; ſince this ſin affects God's eſſence, ſo as to eſtabliſh, as much as ſuch ſinners can do, an unworthy apprehenſion of it in men's minds; whereas falſe worſhip affects chiefly his power and commands. Hence we find that God always ſhewed the

greateſt abhorrence to this vice, and puniſhed it with the greateſt ſeverity. How came it to paſs then, that a ſin of this high nature ſhould paſs uncenſured by GOD in Micah and the Danites; yea, that the laſt ſhould, at the time of ſettling it, be abſolutely proſpered by God? God's ways, indeed, are unſearchable; but would not this tempt us to imagine, that the charge againſt them is laid unjuſtly?

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIII.

The true distinction between the first and second commandments taught by Moses.

SOME divines divide idolatry into two kinds; one of which is, *renouncing the true God, and worshipping the images of false deities*, which they apprehend to be the only thing forbidden in the first commandment; and the second kind of idolatry is, *worshipping the true God, but as represented by an image*, which they imagine to be an offence against the second commandment. This distinction *between*, or explanation *of* these two commandments, is neither exact nor true.——When the young man asked our Saviour, what he should do to attain eternal life, he refers him to the ten commandments; assuring him that on the performance of them he should live. This is

a full proof that the ten commandments require all kinds of virtue, and guard againſt every kind of vice. All falſe worſhip therefore, as well as idolatry, is forbidden in the two firſt commandments. If there is any kind of falſe worſhip, therefore, which theſe commandments, explained as above, do not reach nor comprehend, the explanation cannot be perfect; for that is a juſt *definition of any thing, which leaves out nothing of the things to be defined*; ὅρος ἐστι ὁ μηδὲν των ὁριζομενων καταλιπων. Longinus in his Fragments.—Now Juſtin tells us, that the Perſians worſhipped the riſing ſun.—They paid their devotions not *to the image* of the ſun, but to the *ſubſtance.* Were theſe Perſians guilty of falſe worſhip, by tranſgreſſing any commandment of God? *They never renounced the true God, and then worſhipped the image of a falſe deity, nor worſhipped the true God in the ſhape of an image.* They tranſgreſſed, therefore, neither of the two firſt commandments, if the given explication is perfect. Some nations, again, bowed down to the queen of night, as ſhe ſhone in the heavens, and kiſſed their hands in token of adoration.—— But were thoſe men guilty of falſeworſhip?

They

They were, if we may believe Job, xxxi. 26, 27, 28; *If I beheld the ſun when it ſhined; or the moon walking in brightneſs; and my heart hath been ſecretly enticed, or my mouth hath kiſſed my hand; this ſurely were an iniquity worthy of judgment; for I ſhould have denied the God that is above.* This is certainly a falſe worſhip, but it falls not under the firſt or ſecond commandment, explained in the manner above propoſed. Beſides, if the firſt commandment implies renouncing of the true God, and worſhipping the images of falſe deities, it is very ſurpriſing that there ſhould not one ſyllable be there mentioned about images.—Thoſe, therefore, who would juſtly diſtinguiſh thoſe two commandments, muſt go another way to work.—The firſt commandment has nothing to do with *idolatry*, as the word ſtrictly ſignifies the *worſhip of images*. It is reſtrained to that worſhip which was paid to the ſun, moon, and ſtars, as well as other demons which were worſhipped without an image. The ſecond commandment forbids any image-worſhip, whether directed to the true God, or the falſe and fictitious deities. For *Peſel* ſignifies any graven image,

whether the deity repreſented by it is true or falſe. Thus in Deut. vii. 5, it ſignifies the image of a falſe deity. *Thus ſhall ye deal with them* (the falſe deities); *ye ſhall deſtroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images* (Peſilihem) *with fire.* The firſt commandment then reſpects all falſe worſhip; the ſecond reſpects all image-worſhip. This explanation is comprehenſive and eaſy, and belongs to Moſes himſelf, who explains the ſecond commandment in Deut. iv. 15, 16, 17, 18, and the firſt commandment in the 19th verſe. *Take ye therefore good heed unto yourſelves, (for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude in the day that the LORD ſpoke unto you in Horeb out of the midſt of the fire) leſt ye corrupt yourſelves, and make a graven image, the likeneſs of any figure; the likeneſs of male and female; the likeneſs of any beaſt that is on the earth; the likeneſs of any winged fowl that flieth in the air; the likeneſs of any thing that creepeth on the ground; the likeneſs of any fiſh that is in the waters beneath the earth.* As this precept was given to the Jews, no doubt it forbid, *chiefly in reſpect of them*, the worſhip of the true God in the ſhape of any image; but as this precept was de-

ſigned

ſigned alſo for all mankind, it forbids plainly all image-worſhip whatſoever.——After this, follows an explanation of the firſt commandment. *And leſt thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and, when thou ſeeſt the ſun and moon, and the ſtars, even all the hoſts of heaven, ſhouldſt be driven to worſhip them, and to ſerve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven.* In the ſecond commandment, then, *Peſel* ſignifies a graven image in general, whether of the true God, or of any fictitious deity.——Julian the apoſtate indeed, the revolting Jews, a few men of that ſtamp may be ſaid to have renounced God, and then to have worſhipped falſe deities; but the wiſeſt philoſophers, and a great part of the heathen world worſhipped what they thought the true God, though unhappily in the ſhape of an image. Socrates no more worſhipped another god than Jeroboam; only that Socrates was ſomewhat excuſable in bowing before an image, if he ever could be brought to act ſo low beneath his natural light, for want of a divine revelation; whereas Jeroboam ſinned againſt the revealed light, the

expreſs will of God, and was therefore altogether inexcuſable. *Thou haſt gone*, ſays God to Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv. 9, *and made thee other gods*. His pretending to worſhip the true God under a repreſentation, was rather an aggravation of his idolatry.

CHAP. XXXIV.

The concluſion, with a vindication of Micah's character attempted.

WE have ſeen that Peſel is a general word for any *graven image*, and Grotius affirms that it ſignifies alſo an *altar*, viz. one of thoſe engraved, memorial-ſtones, which we have, with great probability, concluded to be in their houſes of prayer. In this diſſertation therefore, I pretend with juſtice to propoſe ſuch an hypotheſis; and this hypotheſis partly depends on the great ſkill of Grotius in languages. Had that truly learned man undertook to prove that *Peſel* ſignified ſuch a little ſtone-altar, plated probably with ſilver, to give it the greater reſemblance to the altar in the tabernacle, he would, doubtleſs, have given greater ſatisfaction to men of

of learning; and every candid man will pardon me, if I fail only for want of greater ſtrength. I have indeed produced the word *Peſilim* in Judges iii. 19, 26, where the word is tranſlated *quarries*, but ſeems plainly to denote thoſe memorial-ſtones, ſet up to keep in remembrance God's wonderful goodneſs and power exerted in favour of the children of Iſrael, when the river Jordan was driven back at the preſence of God, in order to permit them a dry paſſage. Theſe ſtones Joſephus ſays that Joſhua turned afterwards into an altar. Theſe ſtones were, doubtleſs, held in great veneration, though not worſhipped; and therefore I thought that they might be ſtiled *Peſilim* in a good ſenſe. I have demonſtrated ſome words to have a good ſenſe, which have hitherto been, *in general at leaſt*, confined to a bad one; and it will be hard to prove, why this word ſhould not be capable of a good ſenſe alſo. Moſt interpreters in Judg. iii. 19, 26, have certainly given it a good meaning, ſince our Engliſh tranſlators turn it by *quarries*; Arias Montanus by *dolaturæ*, carvings, or carved ſtones; Pagninus by *lapidicinæ*, *vel loci ubi dolabantur lapides*, car-

carving-places; ſo that I am far from being ſingular in imagining the word capable of a good ſenſe.—The ſight of theſe ſtones in the altar, was certainly very proper to ſtrengthen Ehud's reſolution of delivering Iſrael, or the twelve tribes; the name of each of which was probably engraved on them; ſince a man of each tribe was ordered to bring a ſtone out of Jordan for his own tribe. The teſtimony of thoſe ſtones, as to what God had done, muſt give him confidence in the ſame Almighty power.

Stones or altars too erected as a teſtimony of a covenant ſubſiſting between God and a people, or family, would alſo, doubtleſs, be had in veneration; and therefore might, by chance, be ſtiled *Peſilim* in a good ſenſe: and that ſuch memorial-ſtones were in groves and houſes of prayer, we have in a manner demonſtrated. I hoped therefore, that I had found out the reaſon why Grotius turned the word in this deſcription of Micah's ſacred furniture by an *altar*; and had thence vindicated God's conduct towards man from a ſeeming inconſiſtency, and a

good

good man's character from hitherto-imputed impiety.

But have I not turned Elohim, Judg. xviii. 24, by *divine worſhip*, or divine furniture? And ſince I allow this *Peſel* a principal part in the divine worſhip, will it not thence follow, that it was worſhipped? Should ſuch an objection ariſe, it will ſhew only the ſophiſtry of the propoſer, in confounding the object of divine worſhip with the furniture uſed in it. It is certainly no uncommon figure of ſpeech, to put the *poſſeſſor* for the thing *poſſeſſed*; and if the context will allow it, we may ſuppoſe it here. Now if we paraphraſe the verſe, it may ſtand thus: *And he ſaid, Ye have taken away my divine furniture, which I made, and the prieſt, and ye are going away; ye have left nothing at all of my conſecrated things, but have taken them all, and yet ye ſay, What aileth thee?* In Pſ. xliii. 4, David ſays, *Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy.* Now David, while clothed with mortality, could not go unto God by way of *viſion or immediate fruition*, but only by way of *ſervice*; and therefore *to go unto God*, muſt mean to go unto *God's ſervice*;

vice; or unto *the altar*, the principal part of the ſervice, as furniture uſed in worſhip, but not as the object of worſhip.

Suppoſe that a man had robbed a church of the conſecrated plate, and a religious man of the pariſh, who conſtantly attended the ſacrament, on knowing and ſeeing the ſacrilegious perſon, ſhould ſay to him, that he had robbed him of his *divine worſhip* at the altar; will it follow that the religious man worſhipped the conſecrated plate? Would it not be underſtood that he ſpoke figuratively?—And why, then, may we not ſuppoſe that Micah, in his warmth and hurry, put one word to expreſs a great many, by a way of ſpeaking familiar to authors, eſpecially when the ſenſe of the place conducts us to give the word that turn? for why ſhould he ſay, *And what have I left?* unleſs he meant by *Elohim* all the furniture in his houſe of prayer. Grotius indeed turns the word there by *angels*, which he would have to be the teraphim; and if that ſignification takes place, ſtill Micah, as to what any man can prove to the contrary, will be free from the ſin of idolatry.

Spen-

Spencer in his learned Treatiſe of the Urim and Thummim would have the *carved thing* and *molten thing* of Micah to be the two cherubin, and the teraphim to be a repreſentation of the urim in the ephod; and then if Micah's *Elohim* refers to one part of his holy furniture more than another, it will refer to the ephod with the teraphim; becauſe, in leſs important affairs of ſtate, the Levite, probably arrayed with that, prayed to God for his counſel. But the altar ſeems, if an altar was erected, which appears now indubitable, to have the beſt title to the name, ſince it repreſented in ſome meaſure the ark in the tabernacle; and the ark is oftentimes ſtiled Elohim. Thus 1 Sam. xiv. 18, Saul orders Ahijah *to bring hither the ark of God;* and ver. 36, the prieſt ſaid, *Let us draw near hither unto God*, that is, unto the ark of God. Thus Numb. xxvii. 21, *He ſhall ſtand before Eleazar the prieſt, who ſhall aſk counſel for him after the judgment of Urim* before the Lord; that is, before the ark of the Lord. In Exod. xvi. 33, 34, we ſee that *to lay up before the Lord*, is explained by *to lay up before the teſtimony or ark of the Lord;* and Bertram with juſt reaſon ob-

ſerves, that *before the LORD* or *to the LORD* are forms of ſpeaking, which are generally underſtood of the ark or tabernacle. Thus *Elohim*, in Scripture, is often put for the place or chief furniture of divine worſhip; and therefore Micah may be allowed to expreſs his memorial-altar, or rather his whole divine furniture by it; as well as David, 2 Sam. vi. 5, be ſaid to play *before the Lord*, that is, without doubt before the ark of the Lord, ſince he was then playing with muſical inſtruments before it. My opinion, upon the whole, is this, which (if I can find time to write a diſſertation on the teraphim of the Sabians, the image called ἀλήθεια TRUTH, worn as an enſign of their office by Egyptian chief-judges, and the urim and thummim of the Hebrews) will be ſeen founded on reaſon and antiquity; That Micah was praiſeworthy in his deſign of preparing and furniſhing an houſe of God; that Grotius is right in fixing on the *Peſel* or carved thing to be the altar, which I think to be ſufficiently proved; that the molten thing was ſomewhat in imitation of the laver, Exod. xl. 7, 30, before the altar, where they waſhed before they en-

entered upon their devotions; and that Spencer is right in thinking the ephod and teraphim made in imitation of the *ephod and urim which* the high-prieſt wore; and that this latter part might have a tendency to keep men from the altar of the LORD, and therefore, only as the beginning of evil, blameable.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page	Line	
29.	2,	for *Adal*, r. *Adah*.
34.	laſt,	for *and in their fury*, r. into, *in their fury*.
48.	17,	for *Bethrehod*, r. *Beth-rehob*.
105.	22,	for *the paragogicum*, r. *he paragogicum*.
148.	13,	for *Gilgah*, r. *Gilgal*.
155.	3,	for *Numæ*, r. *Numa*.
175.	12,	for ἐπεσθι, r. ἐπεσσι.
204.	14,	for *Sculptitia*, r. *Sculptilia*.
262.	24,	for *forbid*, r. *forbids*.

Publiſhed by the ſame AUTHOR,

A Critical Latin Grammar, built on the plan of Dr. Lowth's Engliſh Grammar, compared with the *Hermes* of Mr. Harris, and the beſt ancient grammarians as well as modern grammars; with an Introduction conſidering the natural diviſions of time in general; and by the uſe of Latin authors, ſhewing the number, names, and nature of Latin tenſes, and the reaſon of the convertibility of tenſes, which often finds place in the pureſt Latin writers. There is alſo added a very uſeful Index, ſhewing the word governing, and the rule in the grammar by which it governs a particular caſe; ſo that it exhibits the regimen of almoſt every word in any Latin author.

The Author teaches the Latin and Greek languages at Ottery St. Mary, Devon, with any branch of mathematics if deſired. His general method is to teach,

1. His Critical Grammar, (notes excepted,) and Verbs in Eton way; Sententiæ; Corderius without tranſlation, becauſe the lad may tranſlate; and for exerciſes, either tranſlate Latin into Engliſh, or Turner's Examples to Accidence into Latin. Then he proceeds with Phædrus' Fables; ſome ſelect Colloquies of Eraſmus, Martial's ſelect Epigrams, Ovid's ſelect Epiſtles, and Terence; and for exer-

ciſes, tranſlation from Latin authors; or into Latin from Pantheon, Roman Antiquities, or Roman Hiſtory by way of queſtion and anſwer.

At this time boys begin their Eton Greek Grammar, and learn to make Latin verſes and themes, with other tranſlations. I then put into their hands Græcæ Sententiæ; Moral Sentences in Poetæ Minores; two of Iſocrates' Orations to Demonicus and Nicocles; Apollodorus' Fabulous Hiſtory; Lucian's Dialogues; and in Latin Eutropius, Juſtin, Cæſar's Commentaries, Ovid's Metamorphoſis; with the Geography of each explained by Cellarius: after this, Heſiod with Virgil's Georgics; Theocritus with Virgil's Eclogues; Homer with Virgil's Æneids; Pindar and Horace, with a Satire or two of Juvenal and Perſius. If the boy's age admits of it, then he reads a few Greek Comedies from Ariſtophanes, Tragedies from Euripides; with a few ſelect Orations from Cicero, Cicero's Epiſtles, Pliny's Epiſtles; or, indeed, any good author.

If the boy learns figures, then I uſe Ward's Introduction to Mathematics, Euclid, Uſe of the Globes by Watts, Emerſon's Trigonometry and Mechanics, La Hire's Conic Sections, Keil's Aſtronomy, Rowe's and Emerſon's Fluxions, and Newton's Principia, with Martin's Philoſophia Britannica.

N. B. I read Greek according to quantity, as to length in the long or ſhort vowels, and obſerve accent in height by a quick elevation or ſharpening of the voice without extenſion on an acute accent. A man who plays on a harpſichord, ſpinnet, or organ, will eaſily conceive that a ſound may be heightened and not lengthened, *& vice verſâ*, and have a juſt idea of reading conjointly by quantity and accent.

As the author is willing to confine his application to the inſtruction of twenty boys, he propoſes ſixteen guineas *per ann.* for boarding and teaching; with one guinea to the writing-maſter, and two guineas entrance.

Vale, prælum.
Hic cæſtus atque arma repono.

J51-1

BS1305.8 .C69
Miscellaneous dissertations, arising
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00219 2153